In The Matter Of:

BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD APPEALS HEARING

APPEALS HEARING - Vol. 8 June 19, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

101 Arch Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617.542.0039 Fax: 617.542.2119

Volume VIII

Pages 1-57

Brookline Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

June 19, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc.

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

Page 2

```
1
                            Appearances
 2.
      Board Members:
      Jessie Geller, Chairman
      Jonathan Book
 5
      Chris Hussey
 6
      Mark Zuroff, Associate Member
      Avi Liss, Associate Member
 8
 9
      Samuel Nagler, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein
10
      Edith M. Netter, Esquire,
11
      Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.
12
      Alison Steinfeld,
13
      Planning & Community Development Director
14
      Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning
15
16
      Representatives of Chestnut Hill Realty:
17
      Marc Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty
18
      Joseph Geller, Stantec Consulting
19
      Theo Kindermans, Stantec Consulting
20
      Steven Schwartz, Esquire, Goulston & Storrs
21
22
23
24
```

Page 3

```
Members of the Public:
 1
      Anthony Abner, 265 Russett Road
      Judith Leichtner, 121 Beverly Road
      Betsy DeWitt, 94 Upland Road
 5
      Nancy Daly, 161 Russett Road
      William Pu, 249 Beverly Road
 6
      Robin Koocher, Beverly Road
      William Varrell, 45 Asheville Road
 8
 9
      Ruben Pollard
10
      Alisa Jonas
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

| 1 | PROCEEDINGS: |
|----|---|
| 2 | 7:08 p.m. |
| 3 | MR. JESSIE GELLER: Good evening, everyone. |
| 4 | We are calling this continued hearing. This is a |
| 5 | continued hearing for the Residences of South |
| 6 | Brookline. |
| 7 | Again, to my extreme left is Avi Lis, Mark |
| 8 | Zuroff, Jonathan Book, Chris Hussey, my name is Jessie |
| 9 | Geller, our legal counsel, Sam Nagler, Edie Netter, who |
| 10 | is also assisting us. |
| 11 | A few pieces of information. Earlier in the |
| 12 | week or actually, this morning there was an effort |
| 13 | to hold a site visit. As you may recall, at the last |
| 14 | hearing we announced that somebody made the terrific |
| 15 | suggestion that maybe it would be a good idea if we |
| 16 | held a site visit in something other than seven degree |
| 17 | temperatures. |
| 18 | I fully applauded the suggestion, and every |
| 19 | effort was made to try to accommodate people's |
| 20 | different time frames and requests, and I understand |
| 21 | there was a scheduled time and date for this morning. |
| 22 | Unfortunately, not everyone was able to |
| 23 | receive adequate notice and we thought that it would be |
| 24 | more advantageous for everybody if we rescheduled that |

site visit and we will do that. At the end of this 1 2 hearing, we will try and figure out a date where all of our schedules with allow for it. Tonight's hearing, as you may also recall from 5 the last hearing, is going to focus on an initial stab from our peer reviewer who has been engaged. This is 6 Ted Touloukian. And I understand that this evening he will give us, preliminarily, parameters for what his peer review will entail. I understand that there remains outstanding a 10 11 number of plans that would enable him to speak more fully, so we will have Ted speak to us again about the 12 13 parameters and a little bit about his process. 14 The ZBA may want to ask some questions about 15 that, which they will have an opportunity to do. We will then, as we have in the past, offer the public an 16 17 opportunity to ask -- if there are questions about 18 process involving the peer review, they can ask me those questions and I'll try and get, as best as I can, 19 20 answers for you. And we will give the applicant an 21 opportunity as well if they have questions, to pose 22 those questions, if they have a response to testimony 23 that's been given, limited to design review. 24 A few administrative details: The first is,

as I believe I made at the last hearing, I would 1 2 request again that electronic copies of various plans, specifications, and other materials be submitted as quickly as possible, please, so that we can get moving 5 on things that we need to do. I will note that those materials are due by July 3rd. 6 Mr. Swartz, do you have a sense of the status 8 of those materials? MR. SHWARTZ: I'm not sure which materials you're referring to. 10 11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I'll give you the list. 12 Well, we'll give it to you writing as well, but we have 13 an electronic model of the revised plan in SketchUp. I 14 assume that means something. Apparently, the model 15 viewed by the peer reviewer and a representative of the 16 Planning Department is not acceptable and, therefore, 17 it's not available to anybody. 18 MR. SHWARTZ: We haven't agreed to do that. 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: You have not agreed? 20 MR. SHWARTZ: No. MS. NETTER: My understanding is that the peer 21 reviewer needs to see a model, and that you've 22 23 developed a model, but he doesn't have the software so 24 that in order to see the model he has to come to your

office. Also, town staff is not able to see that 1 2 model, or the public unless they come to your office. Not being particularly knowledgeable about design software, I'll tell you that my understanding, I 5 have been told that SketchUp would be the appropriate software so that everybody can view the model. 6 MR. KINDERMANS: Good evening. My name is Theo Kindermans. I'm a site planner at Stantec. 8 SketchUp is not the appropriate model. 10 have Studio 3D Max, which is the software that any 11 professional would use. And it's such a complex model 12 because it encompasses the entire terrain and it has 13 all the elevations and it just can't be dumbed down to 14 a SketchUp model because that's what will happen, we'll 15 lose all the context, all the trees will be out of the model. It's just -- it's not possible to have a model 16 17 that would be useful at all. The buildings themselves, they are in 18 19 SketchUp. They can be viewed in SketchUp because they 20 are relatively simple and have angles. But the complex 21 model -- complex terrain model, as this is, just simply 22 can't be dumbed down to a SketchUp model. It's like, 23 you know, you have a Mercedes and people are asking for 24 a Yugo.

1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: How do we get a model that 2 can be fully viewed in the hands of our --3 MS. SELKOE: May I? MR. JESSIE GELLER: Yes. Polly Selkoe, 5 Planning Department. MS. SELKOE: Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director 6 of Regulatory Planning. It has been typical, up to a few years ago, that we would get 3D models. And, you know, the whole 9 10 purpose of our whole process here is to have 11 transparency and to have the public be able to see the 12 model and certainly the staff to be able to see the 13 model. 14 If they can't provide it in the form that we 15 can see it, it really doesn't do much good, so maybe 16 they want to go back to the old fashioned way of having 17 the old 3D models. I can tell you there are many, many developers that have done them for us and they're very 18 19 good. You can put them right on the table, you can 20 turn them around, you can see all the different 21 buildings from different angles and the height. 22 MR. HUSSEY: You mean a physical model? 23 digital model, but a physical model? 24 MS. SELKOE: Yes, that's what I meant.

1 MR. HUSSEY: I agree. Because the digital 2. model, unless it's fully interactive, then the developer picks the views and what have you. But a physical model sits here out in the hall 5 and everyone can look at it from whatever direction they want to. So I agree. My preference would be to 6 have a physical model of the project. The short story -- and this has MS. NETTER: to be discussed further -- is that we do need some form of model, whether it's virtual or physical. 10 11 something that the staff, our peer reviewer, and the 12 public has to have accessible to it. 13 MR. JESSIE GELLER: There's also an updated 14 version --1.5 MR. SCHWARTZ: Mr. Chairman. 16 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Sure. 17 MR. SCHWARTZ: We'll consider that request. 18 It's not required by the 40B regulations, nor, to my knowledge, is it required by the Town of Brookline's 19 20 regulations. But we will consider that request. 21 Our understanding was that the computer model 22 was what was requested. At great expense, that's what 23 the applicant has done. And we think this is an 24 extraneous -- an extra request that's not required by

- 1 the regulations. We will take it under advisement.
- 2 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Ms. Selkoe, don't we
- 3 require models?
- 4 MS. SELKOE: In the zoning bylaws, it is
- 5 definitely required for any design review project,
- 6 especially for any major impact project. It's also
- 7 typical that for a large major project we would have
- 8 some kind of model.
- 9 MR. SCHWARTZ: There is a model,
- 10 Mr. Chairman. 760 CMR requires preliminary site
- development plans and preliminary scaled architectural
- 12 plans and those have been provided.
- 13 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. Next, an updated
- 14 version of all the information that was provided
- relative to the original plan to be provided for the
- 16 new plan. So similar informational request.
- 17 Additional information not yet submitted
- 18 relative to the original application, which I think in
- our first hearing we had run through the list. And
- 20 staff will assist in outlining what remains
- 21 outstanding.
- 22 And lastly, there was a request for data for
- 23 traffic, stormwater, and design peer reviewers, so I
- think there was some outstanding data from those

- 1 reviewers.
- 2 MS. STEINFELD: The Town actually hasn't
- 3 requested that yet, but staff will provide further
- 4 information to the applicant.
- 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. Next agenda item:
- 6 It seems to me that given the status of the information
- 7 that we received, I just want to note that at some
- 8 point we will be seeking an extension of the time, so
- 9 there will be some discussion about that. Obviously,
- 10 we would need full plans, and any delay in receipt of
- 11 those will impact time.
- MR. SCHWARTZ: I just want to go on the
- 13 record, Mr. Chairman. We'll consider a request when it
- 14 comes. We feel we've submitted everything that's
- 15 required by 760 CMR.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: So noted.
- MR. NAGLER. I'd just like to comment on that
- 18 briefly. The regulation is very clear that you cannot
- 19 require more or different than what would be similar
- for a similar non-40B development, but I don't read the
- 21 regulations as saying you must ask for less than what
- is required for a similarly situated market
- development.
- MS. NETTER: And I think, as Attorney Schwartz

is well aware, you provided a revised plan but you 1 2 haven't provided a full plan set to accompany that conceptual site design that you've done. MR. SHWARTZ: I think if there are details, as 5 Allison said, that we have not provided in terms of that full plan set, that actually -- that may be the 6 case and we can provide that. As far as what you just said, I think the purpose of 40B is provide preliminary plans, not 9 engineered plans. I think we've provided above and 10 11 beyond what's required here. I think this model issue 12 is illustrative of the fact that we were acting in good 13 faith and now we're being asked to do something above 14 and beyond what we contemplated, at great cost. 1.5 And if it's in the context of well, you 16 haven't given us everything we need, so we're going to 17 need more time, we'll consider that. But I just wanted to go on the record. I believe we have given 18 everything that's required under 760 CRM. 19 20 MR. NAGLER: But if you're using the 21 Yugo/Mercedes analogy, if you have a beautiful Mercedes 22 but it's parked in your garage and nobody can see it, 23 it doesn't do anybody any good. 24 MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, I don't know what to say

- 1 about that. I think people can see it at our
- 2 consultant's office and I think -- I'll leave it to
- 3 them to say, but it doesn't sound like the software
- 4 that's being used here is all that unusual.
- 5 MR. HUSSEY: Mr. Schwartz, you said somebody
- 6 requested the digital model, I believe?
- 7 MR. SHWARTZ: It was our understanding -- and
- 8 correct me if I'm wrong -- that that was what was being
- 9 requested of us, the digital model.
- MR. HUSSEY: By who? Could you be specific
- 11 about that? Because I would have been surprised
- 12 myself.
- 13 MR. SCHWARTZ: I don't want to misspeak. I
- 14 believe it was by the peer reviewer.
- MR. TOULOUKIAN: We did request a 3D model,
- and we did request it in multiple formats.
- 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Introduce yourself,
- 18 please.
- 19 MR. TOULOUKIAN: My name is Ted Touloukian,
- and I am the peer reviewer for the project.
- 21 Just to clarify, we have requested a 3D model
- 22 in multiple different digital formats of which the
- 23 digital format that they have would be acceptable. If
- they send it to us, that's fine.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you. That answers 1 2 that question. MR. JESSIE GELLER: I would ask that the applicant and the staff discuss the details about the 5 additional information submittals and continue that discussion. And also about the time line and potential 6 extensions. We had intended to have, on July 10th, a hearing that was going to be dedicated to final peer 9 10 review. Unfortunately, given where we are in terms of 11 receipt of plans, we think that that date is not going 12 to be achievable and therefore we will cancel the July 13 10th date and instead our next hearing will be July the 14 23rd, same time, 7:00, at which time we will hear a 15 presentation from our design peer reviewer. 16 MS. NETTER: Assuming the information is 17 provided in a timely fashion that the peer reviewer needs to conduct his peer review. 18 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. The schedule 20 will accordingly be adjusted, and we'll have an update 21 about that at that time. 22 One last administrative detail: If you do 23 plan on speaking this evening, as I've asked before, I 24 would ask that you listen to what people have to say.

- 1 If you are speaking, start by -- speak at the podium to
- 2 my left and start by giving your name, your address,
- 3 speak loudly and clearly into the microphone so
- 4 everyone can hear you, and obviously, be courteous.
- 5 Thank you.
- 6 Mr. Touloukian?
- 7 MR. TOULOUKIAN: Good evening. Thank you,
- 8 Mr. Chairman, members of the board, residents, and
- 9 concerned citizens. My name is Ted Touloukian. I'm an
- 10 architect and president of Touloukian & Touloukian,
- 11 Incorporated, an architect and urban design firm at
- 12 151 Pearl Street, Boston, Massachusetts. I've been
- 13 retained by the Town of Brookline and the Zoning Board
- of Appeals to perform peer review of the Chestnut Hill
- 15 Realty Residences of South Brookline.
- 16 This evening I would like to outline our role,
- 17 the current status of our review, present some initial
- 18 design principles, and listen to comments from
- 19 tonight's hearing.
- 20 As the peer reviewer, we are not the design
- 21 architect for the project, but an independent reviewer
- 22 of the design. In general, we understand the intent of
- our peer review role is to provide a transparent
- opinion of the conceptual design for the proposed site

of the building within the neighborhood context. 1 2 Over the past eight weeks, we have been introduced to the project and have met with the town staff members, the applicant, and members of the design 5 We have had an exchange of information and a productive and informative conversation. We have 6 download and reviewed the report of the Brookline Neighborhood Conservation District Commissions on site eligibility of the Hancock Village 40B proposal, the Cecil Group Handbook, "An Approach to 40B Design 10 11 Reviews," and letters to the ZBA from the town boards 12 and departments and the general public. 13 During this process, the applicant has also 14 intermittently presented rendered site plans, schematic 15 floor plan options, elevation studies, and conceptual 16 3D maps and proposals. And as of last week, we have 17 received a revised conceptual site plan and other 18 documents from the applicant. Currently, we have not yet received a complete 19 20 design package and as a result, we have not yet been 21 able to provide a peer review for the project at this 22 time. We have requested, through the Town's office, 23 additional information in order for us to provide our 24 peer review and to date we have not received a day when

final documents will be provided to our office. 1 2 As in any complex project, there are multiple layers to review that are necessary for gaining an understanding of the appropriateness of the project 5 design within the neighborhood context. A thoughtful design review begins with an understanding of the 6 existing context and neighborhood characteristics. Our initial overall impression is that the proposed site mediates between the garden village model of housing and a green belt adjacent to the residential 10 11 neighborhood fabric. There is a beautiful, natural 12 topography that exists on the site. Mature trees and 13 light-filter canopies intermix within the residential 14 neighborhood. The garden village model is clearly 1.5 conveyed on the site and there is a respect for the 16 natural and topographical character, separation of 17 pedestrians from the automobile traffic, and a clear relationship between the living space away from the 18 19 street and towards the green belt. 20 There is a defining scale and a clear 21 hierarchy between the architecture and landscape. 22 context seems to embody a balance between the natural 23 characteristics and the residential fabric, a 24 recognition in the balance between the natural

resources and the built form that extend into the 1 2 neighborhood. Our objective is simply to understand not only the past and future intent, but the quality and 5 experience of the existing context, a sense of place so that we can be responsible and make responsible and 6 informed opinions of the appropriateness of the proposed project. We have established some initial design principles. Understanding the existing context is the 10 11 foundation for our peer review, and we will pair this 12 with some initial design principles throughout our 13 review process. These are parameters and questions 14 that we will study relative to the applicant's pending 15 proposal, and these principles may expand as we are presented with more information. They are as follows: 16 17 To begin with, we want to understand the land use guidelines, review the underlying zoning 18 dimensional regulations of maximum height, setback from 19 20 adjacent properties, open space, and floor area ratio; 21 understand these properties and parameters relative to 22 the proposed design, but also recognize that the 23 fundamental function and relationship of setbacks and 24 other dimensional regulations to the surrounding

neighborhood context are not simply a matter of land 1 2 use requirements, but how they create appropriate dimensional setbacks that are consistent with the neighborhood context. 5 We want to evaluate how the proposed project integrates access into the neighborhood. The site 6 perimeter has a private, residential, and green character that should be taken into account at the maximum extent possible. There is an embodiment that public and private space coexist between the trees and 10 11 the streets and the pedestrian walkways. 12 Site access to the applicant's property to the 13 maximum extent possible should include appropriate 14 landscape screening and respect for adjacent property 1.5 edges. Point of entry should not be abrupt, but integrate with the existing pedestrian, vehicular, and 16 17 bicycle patterns of movement. And site lines and views 18 such as this at Asheville and Russett into the property edges should maintain, to the maximum extent possible, 19 20 the existing character. There is a long-established, 21 mature character along the edges that is beautiful in the residential character and should be considered in 22 23 the proposed design. 24 Another principle, as we had described earlier

in the conversation, is that the site already has an 1 2 amazing existing natural character. There are beautiful, mature landscapes that cannot be recreated. Earlier examples of how landscape can be woven 5 successfully between a built environment should be maintained to the maximum extent possible. There are a 6 majority of existing trees, landscape canopy, and rock outcroppings that support the natural character of the site and balance with the architecture. Parking: Proportion of green space to 10 11 impervious surfaces. The project should assess the 12 circulation patterns of how vehicles enter the site; 13 screening vehicles and spacing automobiles with tree 14 islands to provide canopy and screening to adjacent 15 properties; orienting automobiles in a manner to 16 preserve privacy from headlights shining into adjacent 17 properties and lighting up the sky; and locating automobiles in an area that minimizes the impact to the 18 19 natural setting. 20 The site, as we all know, is rather large and 21 there are many edges and adjacencies and there will be 22 many moments for how that landscape edge should buffer 23 the adjacent properties with either techniques with 24 landscape such as larger trees, shrubs, and green

spaces, and fencing materials of different heights and 1 2 scales that understand how privacy can be maintained without creating hard divisions between properties. Another challenge in the design will be how it 5 blends with the existing development patterns. You may refer to it as "building placement." How do the 6 proposed buildings mediate the existing garden village model and the residential vernacular of the single-family homes; how the design creates comfortable distances between the applicant's proposed building and 10 11 the neighborhood properties; understanding depth of 12 setbacks in proportion to the height of buildings and 13 site lines from abutters not only at an immediate 14 distance but also from longer, larger views deeper 15 across the site. Solar orientation: An effect of shadow not 16 17 only on the property itself but also the open space, 18 the public way, pedestrian walkways, and the natural vegetation of the adjacent sites. These are all things 19 20 that should be considered to the maximum extent 21 possible in building placement. 22 Building massing: Relative scale and 23 proportion to its context. Are the height of the 24 proposed buildings in keeping with the character of the

neighborhood; what is the impact of the scale of the 1 2 proposed buildings relative to the neighborhood; and to instill a continuity between the building footprints and the roof line with the existing residential 5 character. There are many lessons in this fabric between the rolling landscape and the stepping of the building volumes and the natural setting that should be understood to the maximum extent possible. And lastly, at our initial level, is employing architectural detail; encouraging building materials 10 and details in keeping with the neighborhood context. 11 12 Taking lessons and clues from the existing residential 13 character between the siding and the masonry and the 14 roof lines and the window fenestration and the light 15 and shadow that falls on the surfaces is a very large 16 part of making architecture feel alive in its own 17 context -- in its context of the natural setting. 18 So as you stated, these are just initial design parameters and our initial understanding of the 19 20 existing context. We're here tonight to present them 21 and to listen to comments from the hearing itself but 22 also, when we receive the documents that are at their 23 complete state, provide a full peer review that we can 24 provide an opinion on the project for you. Thank you

```
very much, and I look forward to further comments.
 1
 2
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Questions? Mr. Hussey?
 3
               MR. HUSSEY: No.
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: No?
 5
               Are there any questions about process as
      explained?
 6
               (No verbal response.)
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Applicant? Questions?
               MS. JONAS: I'm just wondering what the role
10
      of the -- I'm sorry. Alisa Jonas. I'm a Town Meeting
11
      member from Precinct 16. The impact of the
12
      Neighborhood Conservation District, is that part of
13
      your responsibility to consider or also --
14
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Actually, let me jump in.
1.5
               (Multiple parties speaking.)
               MS. JONAS: -- or is that someone else?
16
17
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Mr. Nagler, Neighborhood
      Conservation District?
18
19
               MR. NAGLER: It could be of some guidance in
20
      terms of planning, but the purpose of a comprehensive
21
      permit overrides all local zoning, including -- all
22
      local rules, including local zoning.
23
               MS. NETTER: That's not correctly stated.
24
      what did you -- let me find out what you wanted to
```

1 say. 2 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I want to respond to the question and make sure that we understand the parameter in which the peer reviewer is going to operate while 5 addressing the question. The only place I'm going was -- the question was whether the peer reviewer, as 6 part of peer review, will consider this ordinance. MS. NETTER: I think we should probably clarify. In terms of the relationship between the 10 Neighborhood Conservation District or any regulation, 11 zoning or otherwise, they provide a framework. 12 applicant can seek waivers from that framework and then 13 it's up to the Board to decide whether to grant those waivers or not. So there's not an automatic override 14 15 of all zoning regulations. On the other hand, they don't function as they 16 would in a non-40B environment. 17 18 MS. JONAS: I'm wondering what role they have in considering those factors like the historic 19 20 preservation aspect, or if that's not part of that peer 21 review part of it. That's all. 22 MR. JESSIE GELLER: If I understand your 23 question, it's whether, as part of peer review, the

peer reviewer considers the content of our local

24

bylaws, whether it's the NCD or whether it's the 1 2. zoning. I think that's your question. MS. JONAS: And the elements of historic preservation. 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: The innate bias within the code. Is that --6 MS. JONAS: No. Not even within the code. Just generally issues that play a role with the design of the current makeup. Is that something that peer review addresses, the design peer review, or is there 10 11 another entity that addresses that? 12 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Do you understand the question? 13 14 MS. NETTER: I'm not sure I get it. 1.5 MR. HUSSEY: Let me try. 16 MR. PU: Could I ask a related question? 17 MR. HUSSEY: Can we finish with this question 18 first? 19 MR. PU: Well, it might clarify her question. 20 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. 21 MR. PU: I'm Bill Pu. I'm a Town Meeting 22 member, and I'm an abutter. 23 You mentioned part of your review would

incorporate a review of how this project would fit

24

- 1 within existing land use guidelines. And I think what
- 2 Alisa Jonas is mentioning is that land use guidelines
- 3 here are not restricted to the zoning but include the
- 4 principles embodied in the Neighborhood Conservation
- 5 District. So we're not talking about needing waivers
- or not waivers, but about the guidelines for
- 7 development that are part of that NCD document. And we
- 8 think that those are land use principles specific to
- 9 this area that probably should be included in the
- 10 review.
- MS. JONAS: And also the historic elements,
- 12 the garden village, the Olmstead --
- 13 MR. PU: Right. So also the historical
- 14 context of it, which I think also dates back to the
- 15 historical 1946 agreement which the reviewer should be
- 16 aware of that established the context of the entire
- development.
- 18 MR. TOULOUKIAN: The information that is being
- 19 referred to is on the website of the Town of Brookline,
- and in our peer review we will review public documents
- as a part of our review.
- 22 MR. NAGLER: Let me take another stab at it
- 23 since I apparently wasn't that clear once again.
- The 40B process is a balance between a

- 1 regional need for affordable housing and local rules.
- 2 Not just zoning rules, all local rules. It's a
- 3 balancing test. And so it would be appropriate for the
- 4 peer reviewer to know the kind of regulatory lay of the
- 5 land, local regulatory lay of the land to guide the
- 6 peer reviewer in that inquiry. It doesn't mean you
- 7 have to rigidly adhere to every rule, but it's
- 8 relevant.
- 9 MR. ABNER: Anthony Abner.
- 10 Having said that, I am interested in knowing
- 11 what is the charge to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Is
- it their responsibility, your responsibility to try to
- 13 interpret 40B regulations, or is it simply to rule on
- 14 Brookline Zoning standards?
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: For purposes of this
- 16 hearing, we are not applying to local standards, local
- ordinances. We are subject to 40B requirements.
- 18 Having said that, it is obviously subject to
- 19 testimony that we receive from a variety of individuals
- including the applicant, the public, and consultants
- 21 and peer reviewers. The content that they utilize in
- 22 the process of providing testimony may include things
- 23 like considerations of local ordinances.
- MR. ABNER: May include.

```
1
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Well, we don't create
 2
      their testimony.
 3
               MR. NAGLER: Well, there's a requirement in
      the regulations to identify waivers from all local
 5
      rules.
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: That's later in the
 6
      process.
 8
               MR. NAGLER: Well, it's part of the
      application, so it's -- knowledge and understanding of
 9
10
      the local rules and regulations, including zoning, is
11
      important. This is not a conventional zoning hearing
12
      where, you know, if you are one foot into a sideline
13
      requirement, you absolutely need a variance, you're
14
      going by variance standards. The 40B overlay has its
1.5
      own set of rules, but it doesn't tell you to ignore,
      just ignore, throw in the trash, whatever, all the
16
      various local rules. You take it into consideration.
17
18
               MS. DEWITT: That's the way you're doing it.
19
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Raise your hand, announce
20
      yourself.
21
               MS. DEWITT: My name is Betsy DeWitt. I'm a
      member of the Board of Selectmen. I understand this
22
23
      property is national register eligible. That would
24
      normally be subject to a Section 106 review process.
```

1 Who will request that clarification on 2. that? It's a federal regulation. It's nothing to do with local zoning or other regulations. We need to know the answer to that question. 5 We cannot let it be ignored. This is a planned garden community of historic significance and national 6 register eligible. MR. NAGLER: The Board cannot deny or condition a comprehensive permit -- it cannot deny a 9 10 comprehensive permit based on the failure to obtain a 11 state or federal permit. It can condition it on 12 obtaining a permit, but it cannot deny it based on 13 that. It can --14 MS. DEWITT: I do not understand your answer 15 to my question. 16 Will someone request, officially, a 17 Section 106 review of a national register eligible 18 property that is under consideration by the Zoning 19 Board of Appeals? 20 MS. NETTER: The 106 review process is not 21 within the Zoning Board of Appeals' jurisdiction in the 22 context of this process. I would respectfully submit 23 that whether it's counsel to the Zoning Board or counsel 24 to the Board of Selectmen, to review that process.

- 1 It's been many years since I was involved -- actually,
- 2 only one for the 106 review process. But it would be
- 3 something that's independent of this process.
- 4 MS. DEWITT: Actually, it's not, because a
- 5 national registered property should be reviewed under
- 6 Section 106. It's a federal regulation, and you have
- 7 no right to ignore it.
- 8 MR. NAGLER: Just reading from the
- 9 regulations, it says, "The Board, in its decision, may
- 10 make a comprehensive permit subject to the securing of
- 11 the approval of any state or federal agency with
- respect to the project which the applicant must obtain
- 13 before building, provided, however, that the Board
- shall not delay or deny an application on the grounds
- of any state or federal approval that has not been
- 16 obtained.
- MS. DEWITT: Someone needs to request a
- 18 Section 106 review in order to know if approval has or
- 19 has not been obtained.
- 20 MR. HUSSEY: If I may, this question was asked
- 21 at one of our earlier hearings, as I recall. And the
- 22 lawyers at that time said that we do not fall under the
- 23 statute that required Mass Historic Commission to rule;
- that that would have to be done, but it would be done

under a separate statute under a separate process. 1 2 that not correct, Sam? MR. LISS: I think what you're speaking about is -- and you are correct. At the time, we were 5 talking about whether, essentially -- just because you're eligible for something, does that mean that 6 you're protected by it as opposed to actually being protected by it? So you're eligible for national historic, but you're not actually a national historic site. And I think that's what you were talking about, 10 11 but not what Ms. DeWitt's question was. 12 MS. DEWITT: All right. Well, given the fact 13 that you can't answer my question, I would urge you --14 if you don't, I will -- find out exactly what 15 application this has to this process and this project. 16 MR. NAGLER: Well, again, I would say if it's 17 a federal permit, the grant of a comprehensive permit can be conditioned -- it can be one of the conditions 18 set forth in the grant of the comprehensive permit. 19 20 We'll discuss it further internally. 21 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. 22 MR. HUSSEY: I guess I do have a question. 23 So you do not have enough material to finish 24 your peer review, I think is what you were saying. I

quess I'd like to know in some detail what would be 1 2 required. I would hope that we would not have to have peer review of traffic and drainage and public safety 5 in order for you to complete your peer review, which is limited to site design and building design. Is that 6 correct? MR. TOULOUKIAN: Maybe I can answer it this way: As of last week, I received a revised site plan 9 and partial elevation studies, some 3D massing that was 10 11 admittedly incomplete by the applicant. And at this 12 point we have not received a final design. 13 And so what we would be looking for is an 14 understanding of what the final design is, not just at 1.5 the site plan level, but in terms of a threedimensional aspect of each of the buildings, the 16 17 height, the dimensions, square footages, the 18 information regarding the site relative to the existing topography and the proposed topography, lighting, 19 20 et cetera. And we have put a request of this 21 information to the Town's office and it's really just 22 at this point a very -- it's an incomplete design. 23 It's just not been completed. 24 I understand that. But I want to MR. HUSSEY:

make sure that the applicant understands what is 1 2 required. By "lighting," you mean site lighting? MR. TOULOUKIAN: Site lighting, solar studies, 5 solar design studies in terms of shade and shadow. MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Is that clear --6 MR. TOULOUKIAN: Demonstration patterns on all facades, materials on all facades in their complete form. 10 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. I'd like to ask the 11 applicant if that's clear. I don't want to have this 12 go to another meeting and still not have complete information. Mr. Schwartz or Mr. Geller? 13 14 MR. SCHWARTZ: I think we need to understand 15 in some more detail, which hopefully we can do through town staff, exactly what more is needed. That's the 16 17 best I can answer that question right now. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. 19 MS. STEINFELD: Allison Steinfeld, Planning 20 Director. And if I may respond on behalf of staff, 21 we're happy to do that and fully expect to do that. 22 MS. NETTER: I know our peer reviewer has said 23 this, but some of the information Mr. Touloukian got, 24 he just received it, so he really hasn't had a chance

- 1 to focus on everything. Staff certainly -- I mean,
- 2 this is all, I don't know, a couple of days ago. This
- 3 is all very recent. And there will be more
- 4 conversation between staff and the applicant specifying
- 5 what's needed within the context of 40B so it's done in
- 6 a fair and complete manner. And I don't think
- 7 Mr. Touloukian is saying that he's going to wait -- he
- 8 must wait for the stormwater and the traffic review.
- 9 But also, so you understand, the only thing
- 10 that's been obtained in terms of a site plan is two
- 11 sheets and I think our peer reviewer has styled that as
- 12 a conceptual site plan, so we don't have a full set of
- documents, a full plan set.
- 14 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. But I wanted to tie down
- what is meant by "a full plan set."
- 16 MS. NETTER: What you got originally in the
- original application. The set of plans that you got.
- Is that correct, Mr. Touloukian?
- 19 MR. TOULOUKIAN: Yes. We had discussed that
- 20 previously. I think the example in the previous
- 21 submission is an example of a more complete package
- than what we have received to date.
- MR. SCHWARTZ: I think it's important that we
- 24 put this in some context, at least from our point of

view, which is, it took a long time, many weeks and 1 2 many months to put together the level of information that was required both for the project eligibility letter as well as for the initial application. There have been discussions that have been 5 going on for the last few months that have led to a 6 revision in the planning which was presented to the Zoning Board at the last session of the hearing. we're doing our best to come up, on an expedited basis, 10 with more detail that will be helpful to the peer 11 reviewer and to the Town. 12 But I'm concerned about the potential -- the 13 people potentially seeing this as that we're not being 14 forthcoming in providing information when I think 1.5 that's really not the context of what's happening 16 here. And I hope that the Board appreciates that and I 17 hope -- I suspect that the staff and peer reviewer do, 18 but I just want to make sure for the record that people 19 really understand what it is that we're talking about 20 here. 21 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Let me say, Mr. Schwartz, 22 that it was not my intent that my tone or the manner in 23 which I said things was in any way accusatory. I 24 understand that this is -- you know, these revisions

and the iterations of revised plans take time and 1 2 people are moving as quickly as possible. I think we're simply trying to work within the scope as best as we can and address timing and address sufficiency of 5 information. MR. HUSSEY: If I may, Mr. Touloukian, you 6 understand that generally the first cut on projects is 8 conceptual and then there's schematic design and then there's design development and then there's contract documents. 10 11 Now, I would call this -- you've seen this 12 package, I'm sure. I would call this design 13 development. It's in really great detail. But I'm not 14 sure that we need to subject the applicant to quite a 15 complete set of drawings as this is. My sense is that somewhere between schematic design and design 16 17 development -- in order for us to sort of move it 18 along, if you could clarify that a bit. Not now, but 19 later in consult with the Building Department. 20 But I think this is beyond what we probably 21 need in order to get a reasonable response from you 22 relative to the peer review on architect and planning. 23 MR. TOULOUKIAN: I would like to just add to 24 that comment. I support what you're saying. I think

there needs to be a little clarification in terms of 1 2 "incomplete" and what the nature of that meant. It meant more that there had been, from my understanding, some changes to the site plan, 5 footprints to the building, and in turn, the heights of the buildings and, in fact, the elevation. So without, 6 actually, an elevation that shows us where windows are and where the limits of the materials are, that's what we're referring to as incomplete. And to Counsel's point about that they're 10 11 moving quickly in this, we have had conversations about it, as we noted in the earlier part of our 12 13 presentation, and I believe there is a lot of good 14 faith. So "incomplete" is not looking towards a 15 greater amount of information such as construction 16 documents. It's more of what is the design, not at 17 just a two-dimensional level, but a three-dimensional level and how does that design work with some of the 18 more environmental aspects that coexist on the site. 19 20 MR. HUSSEY: One other comment I'd like to 21 make is that it's been referred in terms of the 22 historical information and matrix, the garden village 23 aspects of this design. Now, the -- of the original 24 design, the Hancock Village design. This design, both

the original and this latest iteration, has some 1 2 concepts, as I'm sure you're aware, of garden city design which really predated the garden village design. So I'd like to have you comment on that when 5 you get to that -- your final review. MR. TOULOUKIAN: We will include that in our 6 presentation at your request. MR. HUSSEY: Thank you. MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. Any other questions? Mr. Pu? 10 11 MR. PU: Thank you. One is that we talked 12 about the three-dimensional plan. It seems like 13 Mr. Touloukian has the software to do the plan, but 14 none of us do, so that problem has not been resolved, 1.5 how the public will be able to review the plan. 16 The second question is: Mr. Schwartz 17 indicated that they're doing everything they can to 18 provide the information as soon as they can, which we 19 understand. But at the same time, the time pressure is 20 self-imposed, so I feel like we should not be 21 pressuring the peer reviewer to rush to judgment on 22 incomplete information because of time pressure. 23 applicant has control of the time pressure and they 24 should be pressured to adjust the timing based on how

quickly they can produced the data. 1 2 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I think we've made comments about that and I think --MR. HUSSEY: I agree. And I want to refer to 5 the model, the digital model. I assume at some point -- you say that we have to go to your firm but, 6 in fact, can't you take snapshots of the digital model and present it as everything else here? What I would like to suggest is if somebody 10 from the neighborhood can, with the help of the 11 Planning Department, for instance, take this plan and 12 indicate on it what views you would like to see of the 13 development. And then the applicant can freeze those 14 views on his program and they can be shown, they can be 15 printed, or they can be projected on the screen, I believe. Is that not correct? 16 17 MR. JOE GELLER: Joe Geller, Stantec 18 Consulting. Maybe I can make a suggestion that would 19 sort of respond to that comment. 20 What we can do when we've got the model all 21 done is that we can do a fly-through through the model from various locations. So we can sort of take it and 22 23 we can work with the peer reviewer to determine where 24 we want to have this fly-through and then we can come

- 1 and present this fly-through so that everybody can see
- 2 the model.
- MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.
- 4 MS. LEICHTNER: Judy Leichtner, Town Meeting
- 5 member, Precinct 16.
- Just a question for Joe. It sounds like you
- 7 can put some kind of presentation together. But my
- 8 question is, then it won't be seen until -- by anybody
- 9 else other than the peer reviewer until the meeting at
- 10 the end of July. So, again, if people are being asked
- 11 to make any kind of comments, we won't have that
- information. Or did I not understand that correctly,
- 13 Joe?
- 14 MR. JOE GELLER: Well, I think it's a question
- of -- as we go through the peer review, we're modifying
- 16 things in the peer review so that we get the
- information to Ted that he needs. So I think we'll get
- 18 it as soon as we can get it done and make it available.
- 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: The question is about
- 20 how. How will it be distributed --
- 21 MR. JOE GELLER: We'll have to figure that
- 22 out. I'm not sure. I don't know. I'll have to figure
- 23 out how to get it to everyone.
- MS. NETTER: But the goal would be that if the

- 1 hearing on July 23rd were on design, that you would try
- 2 to figure out -- this is a question, really not meant
- 3 to be a statement -- how to make something publicly
- 4 accessible so that the public can be prepared before
- 5 that hearing on the 23rd.
- 6 MR. JOE GELLER: I don't know if we'll have it
- 7 by then, but if we can, I guess we'll try to do that.
- 8 But if not, then at worst case we'll have it for that
- 9 hearing so people can respond to it at the hearing and
- 10 respond to it after they've had a chance to review it
- 11 because we can post it.
- MR. ABNER: I object. How are we supposed to
- 13 be able to make any kind of rational assessment if we
- can't see the plans? I believe that you have the right
- 15 to specify what is going to be available by the
- 16 July 3rd deadline. That has to include the emergency
- 17 access, drainage, parking, and a complete sketch of
- 18 what this is going to look like. And I don't see why
- 19 that can't be done as a PDF format or something else
- that can be put on a town website, as was done for the
- 21 initial proposals.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: So noted.
- MR. VARRELL: William Varrell. I'm a resident
- of 45 Asheville Road. I'm also a PE. And I can say

that we do these 3D models all the time at my job. 1 2 will be easy to make a wave motion video for these fly-throughs, but the concern I have is -- because we do it all the time -- that the person that's going to 5 make the video is going to cherry pick the views and show the project in the best light for them. 6 So I think there needs to be several videos, several angles put on them, and allow the public to have an opinion to say where they should be looking 10 from and what angle, because I know that this 11 perspective -- you can have flyovers way up high, you 12 can have it at ground level, you can change the 13 lighting, you can do anything you want. 14 And I also want to know how these surrounding 15 buildings are going to be modeled. I mean, is this 16 going to be a block format? These details -- like I 17 said, I've done these many times for my job. They 18 should be and can be extremely detailed. So I don't know what kind of criteria this model maker was given 19 20 to show it. Are we going to see red blocks, and are trees actually going to be the trees that are on the 21 22 site, or is someone just going to take them as a 23 general memo and input trees generally? 24 I think Mr. Touloukian has MR. HUSSEY:

already specified that he needs to have detailed 1 2 elevations as part of the model. And I agree with you, the model views should not be just sort of fly over. They should be 5 street-level, pedestrian-level views of the project from various points within the project but also right 6 outside the project on Asheville Road, for instance. MR. VARRELL: One of the other things is, all these views, it seems like there's so much up in the 10 air, whether there will be access from the VFW Parkway, 11 the parking. So he's going to be looking at a model. 12 If someone comes back and the drainage causes them to 13 change all the parking and access, the issue still 14 wasn't resolved, then what is he really reviewing? Is 15 the model that he's reviewing going to be the final 16 as-built approved thumbs up or thumbs down or are they 17 still going to have an option? 18 MR. JESSIE GELLER: We'll allow Mr. Touloukian, who is our peer reviewer, to make these 19 20 discretionary determinations. I think that's why he's 21 been engaged. 22 Mr. Shwartz, is there anything that the 23 applicant wishes to add at this point? 24 MR. SCHWARTZ: No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

- 1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I want to thank everyone 2 for their comments.
- Before we close the meeting, I want to speak
- 4 to the possibility of trying to establish a time, a
- 5 date for a site visit. I've been provided with the
- 6 suggestion of next Tuesday, the 24th.
- 7 MR. HUSSEY: That's all right by me. I'll be
- 8 in Canada.
- 9 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. That date will not
- 10 work. Two of five will not be around. So alternative
- 11 dates?
- 12 MS. STEINFELD: June 23rd could be a
- 13 possibility, although the Town would not be able to
- 14 provide 48-hour notice.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: Mr. Hussey is in Canada.
- MS. STEINFELD: Okay.
- 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Can we look at the
- 18 calendar for July?
- MR. LISS: 7/2 is a Wednesday.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: 7/2 is a Wednesday. Can't
- 21 do that.
- Where are we on the schedule?
- MS. MORELLI: So the 10th you don't meet, and
- the 23rd would be the next hearing.

```
1
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thursday, July 10th?
 2.
      that a possibility?
 3
               UNIDENTIFIED: What time?
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: 8:00.
 5
               My understanding was also that it was
      requested that the property be staked based on the new
 6
      revisions.
               You're shaking your head. Can't be done.
               MS. STEINFELD: Just by way of clarification,
      the Town has not requested that.
10
11
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Ah, okay. Then it's my
12
      error.
13
               MR. HUSSEY: So the 10th of July at 8:00.
14
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: One other matter. I would
15
      request that the working sessions, which seem to be
      constructive, continue.
16
17
               Applicant? Ms. Steinfeld?
18
               MS. STEINFELD: Yes, certainly.
19
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Question, ma'am?
20
               MS. KOOCHER: Robin Koocher, Beverly Road. I
21
     have two questions.
22
               One, will the, I believe, 86 trees which are
23
      suppose to be left there be circled with something
24
      other than the yellow ribbon so that you can see for
```

yourself which ones will be in place and not removed? 1 2 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Good question. MR. JOE GELLER: Sure. MR. JESSIE GELLER: The applicant says yes. 5 MS. KOOCHER: Thank you. And the second question is: Who else from the town will be attending 6 the site visit, please? MR. JESSIE GELLER: Well, anybody is permitted to attend the site visit, but I would note that the site visit is an opportunity for us to walk the site 10 11 and ask whatever questions we may have of the 12 applicant. 13 It's not, actually, an opportunity for 14 testimony. We're not taking testimony on the site. 1.5 MS. KOOCHER: I understand all that. But my 16 question is: Will you be in contact with other 17 commissions and committees to tell them of this meeting 18 and walk-through? 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Well, it's publicly 20 noticed so that everyone has an opportunity to come to 21 the meeting -- to the site visit. And the -- it will 22 be posted; correct? 23 MS. STEINFELD: Yes. 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: So it will be fully

Page 47

posted. 1 2 MS. KOOCHER: Okay. So no notification goes out to all the different --MR. JESSIE GELLER: What's your process? 5 MS. STEINFELD: We'll be happy and we fully intended to send out a notice to all departments, 6 boards, commissions. The only department I can 8 guarantee will be present will be -- someone will be there from the Planning Department. 10 MS. KOOCHER: Thank you. 11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. Any other 12 comments? Questions? Yes, ma'am. 13 MS. JONAS: Alisa Jonas. 14 The borings that were supposed to be done in 15 April to determine the water levels, I heard that they have not been done. Could someone clarify whether they 16 17 have or not and whether they've been peer reviewed? 18 MR. JOE GELLER: They will be addressed during 19 the peer review discussion with the stormwater 20 engineer. 21 MS. JONAS: I'm just wondering if it's been 22 done. 23 MR. JOE GELLER: They were done. The question 24 is about whether the water table --

1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: We'll pick that up at the review -- at the next time that we review that. 2. MS. JONAS: One other question. I'm sorry. The waivers, originally there were 17. Two of 5 them included modular walls, or whatever you call them, which apparently they're not going to be there. At one 6 of the prior meetings, you said that all of those waivers will be discussed at a future meeting, and so when does that happen in the process? MR. JESSIE GELLER: That will get -- the issue 10 11 is -- it will happen later in the process. The exact date, obviously, we don't know because our schedule is 12 in flux. But there will be a full discussion about 13 14 waivers that have been requested by the Board. It will 1.5 be at a public hearing. 16 MS. JONAS: Thank you. 17 MS. LEICHTNER: A follow-up to your 18 question -- Judy Leichtner, Town Meeting member Precinct 16 -- about staking the property. Allison, 19 20 you said you haven't requested that. Is there a reason 21 why this won't be staked, or they haven't requested 22 Or are you planning to request it? Because I 23 think it will be helpful. 24 MS. STEINFELD: We certainly hadn't requested

- 1 it for this morning's site visit because clearly there
- 2 wasn't time. That was clearly up to the Board if they
- 3 would request that -- wanted to request that. But at
- 4 this point I think it might be premature, but maybe the
- 5 applicant could respond better to that or the Board can
- 6 address it.
- 7 MS. LEICHTNER: Why is it premature if there's
- 8 going to be a site visit where we're going to see where
- 9 things are?
- 10 MS. STEINFELD: Then I would direct the
- 11 question to the applicant, if staking could be done --
- 12 I don't even know the date we picked.
- 13 UNIDENTIFIED: July 10th.
- MS. STEINFELD: -- by July 10th.
- MR. LEVIN: Mark Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty.
- 16 To stake out the site would require a surveyor
- 17 to do weeks' worth of work, and we don't have that time
- 18 frame or the inclination.
- 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you for your candid
- 20 response.
- 21 MR. GALLITANO: Tom Gallitano, Town Meeting
- 22 member, Precinct 16.
- What steps, if any, will be taken to permit
- those on the site visit to see the projected height of

various buildings including, especially, the planned 1 2 five-story building in the southern part of the property? MR. JESSIE GELLER: Mr. Levin, Mr. Geller, do 5 you have a response? Is there some mechanism by which you could indicate --6 MR. LEVIN: I think we need to think about 8 that. MR. JESSIE GELLER: It would be helpful. MS. DALY: Nancy Daly from the Board of 10 11 Selectmen. 12 I just want to make sure -- some of us made 13 some substantive comments last time about the revised 14 plan, and I assume all of that information is going to 15 be provided to the peer reviewer. Am I correct in that assumption? 16 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: You are correct. 18 MS. DALY: Thank you. 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: You're welcome. 20 Board, any other questions, comments? 21 MR. ABNER: Last question for me. I promise. Is there a July 3rd deadline for the plans to 22 23 be submitted? 24 MS. NETTER: Right now -- correct me if I'm

wrong -- I don't think there's a specific deadline. 1 2. think we have to work with the applicant, let the applicant know what it is the Town needs for the various peer reviewers from the Zoning Board's 5 perspective and see when the applicant can provide the information. 6 At that point, we have to think through, what 8 do we do with the schedule. So it's a little bit of a moving target, and this is not too unusual. We just have to have enough time to review their information 10 11 once they give it to us. 12 So there is no specific deadline, and 13 hopefully in the working sessions we can work some of 14 that out. And we're glad to let everybody know exactly 15 what we know and what we're doing. MR. POLLARD: Ruben Pollard. I'm an abutter 16 17 to the project. 18 I'm not clear on the next walk-through. there is not time to stake out the site so that the 19 20 Board can see where the buildings lie, then should we 21 be rescheduling -- not rescheduling since we haven't

Merrill Corporation - Boston www.merrillcorp.com/law

really scheduled it. Can we push the walk-through out

another week or so and give them time to be able to do

this work?

22

23

24

1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Mr. Hussey, is there a 2. compelling reason why we should insist on staking? mean, we didn't have it the last time. MR. HUSSEY: No, we didn't have it the last 5 time. It's a hard question. It's not -- I don't 6 think I need it, but I understand the neighbors, people 8 who are not visually experienced in reading drawings and what have you -- it probably would be helpful to 10 have it generally staked out. 11 I think the applicant is right. To have a 12 formal stakeout requires a surveyor to actually spot 13 locate down to the nearest inch where each building is 14 and each corner of the building is. And that degree of 15 specificity I do not think is required. 16 But if there could be a general stakeout as to 17 where the locations of the buildings are in general, I 18 think that might be useful. 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Don't they do that by 20 walking the site with us and saying -- I mean, when we 21 were there the last time, they basically were showing 22 us and indicating where each of the improvements were. 23 MR. SHWARTZ: I just want to point out, this 24 is also -- it's not just the second site walk. It's

- 1 the third, because there was a site walk as part of the
- 2 project eligibility letter. So at neither of those
- 3 prior site walks were these buildings staked.
- 4 MR. BOOK: The site walk in the winter, I
- 5 mean, they showed us where the corner of this building
- 6 would be, the corner of this building. I thought I had
- 7 a good sense of, you know, roughly where the buildings
- 8 would be sited.
- 9 MR. LISS: Maybe this will clarify: If
- 10 there's a question along the walk, the site visit, of
- 11 specificity of where the site lines are, will someone
- from Stantec or from the applicant be able to, within
- 13 reason, point out where a corner or where an end line
- 14 would be?
- MR. JOE GELLER: So the answer is no terms of
- 16 staking it out.
- MR. LISS: I think the answer is no because,
- as the applicant just said, this will be the third site
- 19 visit. They haven't been provided before, and the
- 20 Board has decided that with proper guidance by the
- 21 applicant -- and if you're there you can ask any
- 22 question you'd like -- we feel that the explanation
- 23 will be sufficient.
- MR. POLLARD: So for the visual review of --

is it just for the Board or is it --1 2 MR. LISS: It's an open-site visit. MR. POLLARD: It's an open-site visit. So you think that everyone is going to be able to understand 5 the layout of these buildings without having some visual cues? 6 MR. LISS: If you have a question, I believe 8 there will be a representative from Stantec there to answer any and all questions. 10 MR. SCHWARTZ: I just want to clarify that. 11 The purpose, as I understand it, at the site visit --12 it is to answer the questions of the Board. 13 I think others are -- we're making the site 14 available for others to attend. We're not going to 15 require, you know, people to sign waivers or anything, 16 as I've seen before. Everybody can come. But my 17 understanding is that we will be responsive to the 18 Board's questions. 19 MR. HUSSEY: I think, relative to the height 20 of the building, really the only thing that's going to 21 have -- give you any serious view of what it's going to 22 be like is going to be the model, the digitized model 23 and the viewpoints taken from those models. 24 So I reiterate, you can get a copy of one of

- 1 these plans on the Web and indicate -- I mean, this is
- 2 informal, I know -- and indicate where you would like
- 3 views, within reason. You know, not 1,000 of them, a
- 4 half dozen or so. The developer should be able to
- 5 generate that view from pedestrian height views.
- 6 MR. GALLITANO: Tom Gallitano, Town Meeting
- 7 member, Precinct 16.
- 8 I've seen on past projects the use of balloons
- 9 that are, you know, lifted to a certain height so that
- 10 anyone on the site visit, yourself and others, can see
- 11 visually, without having to guess about it, what the
- 12 height the projected building is.
- 13 MR. HUSSEY: I don't think that would be
- 14 sufficient. It's not just height. It's the massing of
- the building. It's all the physical components of the
- 16 building that tell you what it's going to look like.
- 17 And the 3D view, if properly done, is going to be as
- 18 close as you get and it's going to be much better than
- 19 balloons no matter how many balloons you put up.
- 20 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I want to thank everyone
- 21 for their input and good questions, I want to thank
- 22 Mr. Touloukian for his peer review, and again, I want
- 23 to repeat that the site visit will be July 10th at
- 8:00 a.m. We are meeting -- location -- will it be the

```
same location as what was proposed today?
 1
 2
               MS. STEINFELD: Outside the offices of
      Chestnut Hill, 300 Independence.
 4
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: And the next hearing will
 5
      be July 23rd at 7:00. Thank you, everyone.
                (Proceedings suspended at 8:23 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and
 1
      Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
 2
      Massachusetts, certify:
               That the foregoing proceedings were taken
      before me at the time and place herein set forth and
 5
      that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
      my shorthand notes so taken.
               Dated this 1st day of July, 2014.
 9
10
      Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public
11
      My commission expires November 3, 2017.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

| | Ī | I | İ |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| A | 25:10,11 | 2:12 | 24:12 27:20 30:12 |
| able | addressing | alive | 32:11 33:1,11 34:4 |
| 4:22 7:1 8:11,12 16:21 | 24:5 | 22:16 | 36:14 38:23 39:13 |
| 38:15 41:13 44:13 | adequate | Allison | 43:23 45:17 46:4,12 |
| 51:23 53:12 54:4 | 4:23 | 12:5 33:19 48:19 | 49:5,11 51:2,3,5 |
| 55:4 | adhere | allow | 52:11 53:12,18,21 |
| Abner | 27:7 | 5:3 42:8 43:18 | applicant's |
| 3:2 27:9,9,24 41:12 | adjacencies | alternative | 18:14 19:12 21:10 |
| 50:21 | 20:21 | 44:10 | application |
| abrupt | adjacent | amazing | 1:7 10:18 28:9 30:14 |
| 19:15 | 17:10 18:20 19:14 | 20:2 | 31:15 34:17 35:4 |
| absolutely | 20:14,16,23 21:19 | amount | applying |
| 28:13 | adjust | 37:15 | 27:16 |
| abutter | 38:24 | analogy | appreciates |
| 25:22 51:16 | adjusted | 12:21 | 35:16 |
| abutters | 14:20 | angle | Approach |
| 21:13 | administrative | 42:10 | 16:10 |
| acceptable | 5:24 14:22 | angles | appropriate |
| 6:16 13:23 | admittedly | 7:20 8:21 42:8 | 7:5,9 19:2,13 27:3 |
| access | 32:11 | announce | appropriateness |
| 19:6,12 41:17 43:10 | advantageous | 28:19 | 17:4 18:7 |
| 43:13 | 4:24 | announced | approval |
| accessible | advisement | 4:14 | 30:11,15,18 |
| 9:12 41:4 | 10:1 | answer | approved |
| accommodate | affordable | 29:4,14 31:13 32:8 | 43:16 |
| 4:19 | 27:1 | 33:17 53:15,17 54:9 | April |
| | agency | 54:12 | 47:15 |
| accompany 12:2 | 30:11 | answers | architect |
| account | agenda | 5:20 14:1 | 15:10,11,21 36:22 |
| 19:8 | 11:5 | Anthony | architectural |
| accusatory | ago | 3:2 27:9 | 10:11 22:10 |
| 35:23 | 8:8 34:2 | anybody | architecture |
| achievable | agree | 6:17 12:23 40:8 46:8 | 17:21 20:9 22:16 |
| 14:12 | 9:1,6 39:4 43:3 | apparently | area |
| acting | agreed | 6:14 26:23 48:6 | 18:20 20:18 26:9 |
| 12:12 | 6:18,19 | Appeals | Asheville |
| add | agreement | 1:5 15:14 27:11 29:19 | 3:8 19:18 41:24 43:7 |
| 36:23 43:23 | 26:15 | 29:21 | asked |
| additional | Ah | Appearances | 12:13 14:23 30:20 |
| 10:17 14:5 16:23 | 45:11 | 2:1 | 40:10 |
| address | air | applauded | asking |
| | 43:10 | 4:18 | 7:23 |
| 15:2 36:4,4 49:6 addressed | Alisa | applicant | aspect |
| 47:18 | 3:10 23:10 26:2 47:13 | 5:20 9:23 11:4 14:4 | 24:20 32:16 |
| | Alison | 16:4,13,18 23:8 | aspects |
| addresses | 1115011 | 10.1,10,10 20.0 | |
| | l | I | I |

| 37:19,23 | B | bit | 42:15 50:1 51:20 |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| assess | back | 5:13 36:18 51:8 | 52:17 53:3,7 54:5 |
| 20:11 | 8:16 26:14 43:12 | blends | built |
| assessment | balance | 21:5 | 18:1 20:5 |
| 41:13 | 17:22,24 20:9 26:24 | block | bylaws |
| assist | balancing | 42:16 | 10:4 25:1 |
| 10:20 | 27:3 | blocks | |
| Assistant | balloons | 42:20 | C |
| 2:14 8:6 | | Bluestein | C |
| assisting | 55:8,19,19 based | 2:9 | 1:21 57:1 |
| 4:10 | 29:10,12 38:24 45:6 | board | calendar |
| Associate | * | 1:5 2:2 15:8,13 24:13 | 44:18 |
| 2:6,7 | basically | 27:11 28:22 29:8,19 | call |
| Associates | 52:21 | 29:21,23,24 30:9,13 | 36:11,12 48:5 |
| 2:11 | basis | 35:8,16 48:14 49:2,5 | calling |
| assume | 35:9 | 50:10,20 51:20 53:20 | 4:4 |
| 6:14 39:5 50:14 | beautiful | 54:1,12 | Canada |
| Assuming | 12:21 17:11 19:21 | boards | 44:8,15 |
| 14:16 | 20:3 | 16:11 47:7 | cancel |
| assumption | begins | Board's | 14:12 |
| 50:16 | 17:6 | 51:4 54:18 | candid |
| as-built | behalf | Book | 49:19 |
| 43:16 | 33:20 | 2:4 4:8 53:4 | canopies |
| attend | believe | borings | 17:13 |
| 46:9 54:14 | 6:1 12:18 13:6,14 | 47:14 | canopy |
| attending | 37:13 39:16 41:14 | Boston | 20:7,14 |
| 46:6 | 45:22 54:7 | 1:17 15:12 | case |
| Attorney | belt | briefly | 1:6 12:7 41:8 |
| 11:24 | 17:10,19 | 11:18 | causes |
| automatic | best | Brookline | 43:12 |
| 24:14 | 5:19 33:17 35:9 36:3 | 1:5,8,12 4:6 15:13,15 | Cecil |
| automobile | 42:6 | 16:7 26:19 27:14 | 16:10 |
| 17:17 | Betsy | Brookline's | certain |
| automobiles | 3:4 28:21 | 9:19 | 55:9 |
| 20:13,15,18 | better | buffer | certainly |
| available | 49:5 55:18 | 20:22 | 8:12 34:1 45:18 48:24 |
| 6:17 40:18 41:15 | Beverly | building | certify |
| 54:14 | 3:3,6,7 45:20 | 16:1 21:6,10,21,22 | 57:3 |
| 34.14 Avi | beyond | 22:3,7,10 30:13 32:6 | cetera |
| 2:7 4:7 | 12:11,14 36:20 | 36:19 37:5 50:2 | 32:20 |
| aware | bias | 52:13,14 53:5,6 | Chairman |
| 12:1 26:16 38:2 | 25:5 | 54:20 55:12,15,16 | 2:3 9:15 10:10 11:13 |
| a.m | bicycle | buildings | 15:8 43:24 |
| 55:24 | 19:17 | 7:18 8:21 21:7,12,24 | challenge |
| JJ.∠ T | Bill | 22:2 32:16 37:6 | 21:4 |
| | 25:21 | 22.2 32.10 31.0 | |
| | 1 | 1 | I |

| | İ | İ | i |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| chance | code | concepts | Consulting |
| 33:24 41:10 | 25:6,7 | 38:2 | 2:18,19 39:18 |
| change | coexist | conceptual | contact |
| 42:12 43:13 | 19:10 37:19 | 12:3 15:24 16:15,17 | 46:16 |
| changes | come | 34:12 36:8 | contemplated |
| 37:4 | 6:24 7:2 35:9 39:24 | concern | 12:14 |
| character | 46:20 54:16 | 42:3 | content |
| 17:16 19:8,20,21,22 | comes | concerned | 24:24 27:21 |
| 20:2,8 21:24 22:5,13 | 11:14 43:12 | 15:9 35:12 | context |
| characteristics | comfortable | condition | 7:15 12:15 16:1 17:5,7 |
| 17:7,23 | 21:9 | 29:9,11 | 17:22 18:5,10 19:1,4 |
| charge | comment | conditioned | 21:23 22:11,17,17,20 |
| 27:11 | 11:17 36:24 37:20 | 31:18 | 26:14,16 29:22 34:5 |
| cherry | 38:4 39:19 | conditions | 34:24 35:15 |
| 42:5 | comments | 31:18 | continue |
| Chestnut | 15:18 22:21 23:1 39:3 | conduct | 14:5 45:16 |
| 1:7 2:16,17 15:14 | 40:11 44:2 47:12 | 14:18 | continued |
| 49:15 56:3 | 50:13,20 | Conservation | 4:4,5 |
| Chris | commission | 16:8 23:12,18 24:10 | continuity |
| 2:5 4:8 | 30:23 57:11 | 26:4 | 22:3 |
| circled | commissions | consider | contract |
| 45:23 | 16:8 46:17 47:7 | 9:17,20 11:13 12:17 | 36:9 |
| circulation | committees | 23:13 24:7 | control |
| 20:12 | 46:17 | consideration | 38:23 |
| citizens | Commonwealth | 28:17 29:18 | conventional |
| 15:9 | 57:2 | considerations | 28:11 |
| city | community | 27:23 | conversation |
| 38:2 | 2:13 29:6 | considered | 16:6 20:1 34:4 |
| clarification | compelling | 19:22 21:20 | conversations |
| 29:1 37:1 45:9 | 52:2 | considering | 37:11 |
| clarify | complete | 24:19 | conveyed |
| 13:21 24:9 25:19 | 16:19 22:23 32:5 33:8 | considers | 17:15 |
| 36:18 47:16 53:9 | 33:12 34:6,21 36:15 | 24:24 | copies |
| 54:10 | 41:17 | consistent | 6:2 |
| clear | completed | 19:3 | copy |
| 11:18 17:17,20 26:23 | 32:23 | construction | 54:24 |
| 33:6,11 51:18 | complex | 37:15 | corner |
| clearly | 7:11,20,21 17:2 | constructive | 52:14 53:5,6,13 |
| 15:3 17:14 49:1,2 | components | 45:16 | Corporation |
| close | 55:15 | consult | 1:15 |
| 44:3 55:18 | comprehensive | 36:19 | correct |
| clues | 23:20 29:9,10 30:10 | consultants | 13:8 31:2,4 32:7 34:18 |
| 22:12 | 31:17,19 | 27:20 | 39:16 46:22 50:15,17 |
| CMR | computer | consultant's | 50:24 57:6 |
| 10:10 11:15 | 9:21 | 13:2 | correctly |
| | | | |

| 23:23 40:12 | day | 36:16,16 37:16,18,23 | 9:5 |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| cost | 16:24 57:8 | 37:24,24,24 38:3,4 | Director |
| 12:14 | days | 41:1 | 2:13,14 8:6 33:20 |
| counsel | 34:2 | detail | discretionary |
| 1:10 4:9 29:23,23 | deadline | 14:22 22:10 32:1 | 43:20 |
| Counsel's | 41:16 50:22 51:1,12 | 33:15 35:10 36:13 | discuss |
| 37:10 | decide | detailed | 14:4 31:20 |
| couple | 24:13 | 42:18 43:1 | discussed |
| 34:2 | decided | details | 9:9 34:19 48:8 |
| Court | 53:20 | 5:24 12:4 14:4 22:11 | discussion |
| 57:1 | decision | 42:16 | 11:9 14:6 47:19 48:13 |
| courteous | 30:9 | determinations | discussions |
| 15:4 | dedicated | 43:20 | 35:5 |
| create | 14:9 | determine | distance |
| 19:2 28:1 | deeper | 39:23 47:15 | 21:14 |
| creates | 21:14 | developed | distances |
| 21:9 | defining | 6:23 | 21:10 |
| creating | 17:20 | developer | distributed |
| 21:3 | definitely | 9:3 55:4 | 40:20 |
| criteria | 10:5 | developers | District |
| 42:19 | degree | 8:18 | 16:8 23:12,18 24:10 |
| CRM | 4:16 52:14 | development | 26:5 |
| 12:19 | delay | 2:13 10:11 11:20,23 | divisions |
| cues | 11:10 30:14 | 21:5 26:7,17 36:9,13 | 21:3 |
| 54:6 | Demonstration | 36:17 39:13 | document |
| current | 33:7 | DeWitt | 26:7 |
| 15:17 25:9 | deny | 3:4 28:18,21,21 29:14 | documents |
| Currently | 29:8,9,12 30:14 | 30:4,17 31:12 | 16:18 17:1 22:22 |
| 16:19 | department | DeWitt's | 26:20 34:13 36:10 |
| cut | 6:16 8:5 36:19 39:11 | 31:11 | 37:16 |
| 36:7 | 47:7,9 | different | doing |
| | departments | 4:20 8:20,21 11:19 | 28:18 35:9 38:17 |
| D | 16:12 47:6 | 13:22 21:1 47:3 | 51:15 |
| Daly | depth | digital | download |
| 3:5 50:10,10,18 | 21:11 | 8:23 9:1 13:6,9,22,23 | 16:7 |
| data | described | 39:5,7 | dozen |
| 10:22,24 39:1 | 19:24 | digitized | 55:4 |
| date | design | 54:22 | drainage |
| 4:21 5:2 14:11,13 | 5:23 7:4 10:5,23 12:3 | dimensional | 32:4 41:17 43:12 |
| 16:24 34:22 44:5,9 | 14:15 15:11,18,20,22 | 18:19,24 19:3 32:16 | drawings |
| 48:12 49:12 | 15:24 16:4,10,20 | dimensions | 36:15 52:8 |
| Dated | 17:5,6 18:9,12,22 | 32:17 | due |
| 57:8 | 19:23 21:4,9 22:19 | direct | 6:6 |
| dates | 25:8,10 32:6,6,12,14 | 49:10 | dumbed |
| 26:14 44:11 | 32:22 33:5 36:8,9,12 | direction | 7:13,22 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | 5:11 | 4:24 7:6 40:1 51:14 | extra |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| earlier | encompasses | 54:16 | 9:24 |
| 4:11 19:24 20:4 30:21 | 7:12 | exact | extraneous |
| 37:12 | encouraging | 48:11 | 9:24 |
| | 22:10 | exactly | extreme |
| easy 42:2 | engaged | 31:14 33:16 51:14 | 4:7 |
| | 5:6 43:21 | example | extremely |
| edge 20:22 | engineer | 34:20,21 | 42:18 |
| | 47:20 | examples | |
| edges | engineered | 20:4 | F |
| 19:15,19,21 20:21 Edie | 12:10 | exchange | fabric |
| 4:9 | entail | 16:5 | 17:11,23 22:5 |
| | 5:9 | existing | facades |
| Edith | enter | 17:7 18:5,10 19:16,20 | 33:8,8 |
| 2:10,11 | 20:12 | 20:2,7 21:5,7 22:4,12 | fact |
| effect | entire | 22:20 26:1 32:18 | 12:12 31:12 37:6 39:7 |
| 21:16 effort | 7:12 26:16 | exists | factors |
| | entity | 17:12 | 24:19 |
| 4:12,19 | 25:11 | expand | failure |
| eight 16:2 | entry | 18:15 | 29:10 |
| | 19:15 | expect | fair |
| either | environment | 33:21 | 34:6 |
| 20:23 | 20:5 24:17 | expedited | faith |
| electronic | environmental | 35:9 | 12:13 37:14 |
| 6:2,13 | 37:19 | expense | fall |
| elements | error | 9:22 | 30:22 |
| 25:3 26:11 | 45:12 | experience | falls |
| elevation | especially | 18:5 | 22:15 |
| 16:15 32:10 37:6,7 | 10:6 50:1 | experienced | far |
| elevations | Esquire | 52:8 | 12:8 |
| 7:13 43:2 | 2:9,10,20 | expires | fashion |
| eligibility | essentially | 57:11 | 14:17 |
| 16:9 35:3 53:2 | 31:5 | explained | fashioned |
| eligible | establish | 23:6 | 8:16 |
| 28:23 29:7,17 31:6,8 | 44:4 | explanation | Fax |
| embodied | established | 53:22 | 1:18 |
| 26:4 | 18:9 26:16 | extend | federal |
| embodiment | et | 18:1 | 29:2,11 30:6,11,15 |
| 19:9 | 32:20 | extension | 31:17 |
| embody | evaluate | 11:8 | feel |
| 17:22 | 19:5 | extensions | 11:14 22:16 38:20 |
| emergency | evening | 14:7 | 53:22 |
| 41:16 | 4:3 5:7 7:7 14:23 15:7 | extent | fencing |
| employing | 15:16 | 19:9,13,19 20:6 21:20 | 21:1 |
| 22:9 | everybody | 22:8 | fenestration |
| enable | - C. C. J. D. G. J. | 22.0 | |
| | I | I | I |

| 22:14 | 22:3 37:5 | Gallitano | 40:24 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| figure | foregoing | 49:21,21 55:6,6 | goes |
| 5:2 40:21,22 41:2 | 57:4,6 | garage | 47:2 |
| final | form | 12:22 | going |
| 14:9 17:1 32:12,14 | 8:14 9:9 18:1 33:9 | garden | 5:5 12:16 14:9,11 24:4 |
| 38:5 43:15 | formal | 17:9,14 21:7 26:12 | 24:5 28:14 34:7 35:6 |
| 56.5 45.15 find | 52:12 | 29:5 37:22 38:2,3 | 41:15,18 42:4,5,15 |
| 23:24 31:14 | format | 29.3 37.22 38.2,3 Geller | |
| 23:24 31:14 fine | 13:23 41:19 42:16 | | 42:16,20,21,22 43:11 |
| | | 2:3,18 4:3,9 6:11,19 | 43:15,17 48:6 49:8,8 |
| 13:24 | formats | 8:1,4 9:13,16 10:2,13 | 50:14 54:4,14,20,21 |
| finish | 13:16,22 | 11:5,16 13:17 14:3 | 54:22 55:16,17,18 |
| 25:17 31:23 | forth | 14:19 23:2,4,8,14,17 | good |
| firm | 31:19 57:5 | 24:2,22 25:5,12 | 4:3,15 7:7 8:15,19 |
| 15:11 39:6 | forthcoming | 27:15 28:1,6,19 | 12:12,23 15:7 37:13 |
| first | 35:14 | 31:21 33:13 35:21 | 46:2 53:7 55:21 |
| 5:24 10:19 25:18 36:7 | forward | 38:9 39:2,17,17 | Goulston |
| fit | 23:1 | 40:14,19,21 41:6,22 | 2:20 |
| 25:24 | foundation | 43:18 44:1,9,15,17 | grant |
| five | 18:11 | 44:20 45:1,4,11,14 | 24:13 31:17,19 |
| 44:10 | frame | 45:19 46:2,3,4,8,19 | great |
| five-story | 49:18 | 46:24 47:4,11,18,23 | 9:22 12:14 36:13 |
| 50:2 | frames | 48:1,10 49:19 50:4,4 | greater |
| floor | 4:20 | 50:9,17,19 52:1,19 | 37:15 |
| 1:11 16:15 18:20 | framework | 53:15 55:20 56:4 | green |
| flux | 24:11,12 | general | 17:10,19 19:7 20:10 |
| 48:13 | freeze | 15:22 16:12 42:23 | 20:24 |
| fly | 39:13 | 52:16,17 | ground |
| 43:4 | full | generally | 42:12 |
| flyovers | 11:10 12:2,6 22:23 | 25:8 36:7 42:23 52:10 | grounds |
| 42:11 | 34:12,13,15 48:13 | generate | 30:14 |
| fly-through | fully | 55:5 | Group |
| 39:21,24 40:1 | 4:18 5:12 8:2 9:2 | give | 16:10 |
| fly-throughs | 33:21 46:24 47:5 | 5:8,20 6:11,12 51:11 | guarantee |
| 42:3 | function | 51:23 54:21 | 47:8 |
| focus | 18:23 24:16 | given | guess |
| 5:5 34:1 | fundamental | 5:23 11:6 12:16,18 | 31:22 32:1 41:7 55:11 |
| follows | 18:23 | 14:10 31:12 42:19 | guidance |
| 18:16 | further | giving | 23:19 53:20 |
| follow-up | 9:9 11:3 23:1 31:20 | 15:2 | guide |
| 48:17 | future | glad | 27:5 |
| foot | 18:4 48:8 | 51:14 | guidelines |
| 28:12 | | g ₀ | 18:18 26:1,2,6 |
| footages | G | 8:16 11:12 12:18 | |
| 32:17 | gaining | 33:12 39:6 40:15 | H |
| footprints | 17:3 | goal | half |
| Touchimes | | guai | |
| | I | 1 | l |

| | I | I | ı |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 55:4 | helpful | immediate | 55:2 |
| hall | 35:10 48:23 50:9 52:9 | 21:13 | information |
| 9:4 | hierarchy | impact | 4:11 10:14,17 11:4,6 |
| Hancock | 17:21 | 10:6 11:11 20:18 22:1 | 14:5,16 16:5,23 |
| 16:9 37:24 | high | 23:11 | 18:16 26:18 32:18,21 |
| hand | 42:11 | impervious | 33:13,23 35:2,14 |
| 24:16 28:19 | Hill | 20:11 | 36:5 37:15,22 38:18 |
| Handbook | 1:7 2:16,17 15:14 | important | 38:22 40:12,17 50:14 |
| 16:10 | 49:15 56:3 | 28:11 34:23 | 51:6,10 |
| hands | historic | impression | informational |
| 8:2 | 24:19 25:3 26:11 29:6 | 17:8 | 10:16 |
| happen | 30:23 31:9,9 | improvements | informative |
| 7:14 48:9,11 | historical | 52:22 | 16:6 |
| happening | 26:13,15 37:22 | inch | informed |
| 35:15 | hold | 52:13 | 18:7 |
| happy | 4:13 | inclination | initial |
| 33:21 47:5 | homes | 49:18 | 5:5 15:17 17:8 18:9,12 |
| hard | 21:9 | include | 22:9,18,19 35:4 |
| 21:3 52:6 | hope | 19:13 26:3 27:22,24 | 41:21 |
| head | 32:3 35:16,17 | 38:6 41:16 | innate |
| 45:8 | hopefully | included | 25:5 |
| headlights | 33:15 51:13 | 26:9 48:5 | input |
| 20:16 | housing | including | 42:23 55:21 |
| hear | 17:10 27:1 | 23:21,22 27:20 28:10 | inquiry |
| 14:14 15:4 | Hussey | 50:1 | 27:6 |
| heard | 2:5 4:8 8:22 9:1 13:5 | incomplete | insist |
| 47:15 | 13:10 14:1 23:2,3 | 32:11,22 37:2,9,14 | 52:2 |
| hearing | 25:15,17,20 30:20 | 38:22 | instance |
| 1:5 4:4,5,14 5:2,4,5 | 31:22 32:24 33:6,10 | incorporate | 39:11 43:7 |
| 6:1 10:19 14:9,13 | 33:18 34:14 36:6 | 25:24 | instill |
| 15:19 22:21 27:16 | 37:20 38:8 39:4 40:3 | Incorporated | 22:3 |
| 28:11 35:8 41:1,5,9,9 | · · | 15:11 | integrate |
| 44:24 48:15 56:4 | 52:1,4 54:19 55:13 | Independence | 19:16 |
| hearings | | 56:3 | integrates |
| 30:21 | <u> </u> | independent | 19:6 |
| height | idea | 15:21 30:3 | intended |
| 8:21 18:19 21:12,23 | 4:15 | indicate | 14:8 47:6 |
| 32:17 49:24 54:19 | identify | 39:12 50:6 55:1,2 | intent |
| 55:5,9,12,14 | 28:4 | indicated | 15:22 18:4 35:22 |
| heights | ignore | 38:17 | interactive |
| 21:1 37:5 | 28:15,16 30:7 | indicating | 9:2 |
| held | ignored | 52:22 | interested |
| 4:16 | 29:5 | individuals | 27:10 |
| help | illustrative | 27:19 | intermittently |
| 39:10 | 12:12 | informal | 16:14 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| intermix | Joe | 51:15 53:7 54:15 | led |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 17:13 | 39:17,17 40:6,13,14 | 55:2,3,9 | 35:6 |
| internally | 40:21 41:6 46:3 | knowing | left |
| 31:20 | 47:18,23 53:15 | 27:10 | 4:7 15:2 45:23 |
| interpret | Jonas | knowledge | legal |
| 27:13 | 3:10 23:9,10,16 24:18 | 9:19 28:9 | 4:9 |
| Introduce | 25:3,7 26:2,11 47:13 | knowledgeable | LegaLink |
| 13:17 | 47:13,21 48:3,16 | 7:3 | 1:15 |
| introduced | Jonathan | Koocher | Leichtner |
| 16:3 | 2:4 4:8 | 3:7 45:20,20 46:5,15 | 3:3 40:4,4 48:17,18 |
| involved | Joseph | 47:2,10 | 49:7 |
| 30:1 | 2:18 | Krakofsky | lessons |
| involving | judgment | 1:21 57:1,10 | 22:5,12 |
| 5:18 | 38:21 | Kristen | letter |
| islands | Judith | 1:21 57:1,10 | 35:4 53:2 |
| 20:14 | 3:3 | Krokidas | letters |
| issue | Judy | 2:9 | 16:11 |
| 12:11 43:13 48:10 | 40:4 48:18 | | level |
| issues | July | L | 22:9 32:15 35:2 37:17 |
| 25:8 | 6:6 14:8,12,13 40:10 | land | 37:18 42:12 |
| item | 41:1,16 44:18 45:1 | 18:17 19:1 26:1,2,8 | levels |
| 11:5 | 45:13 49:13,14 50:22 | 27:5,5 | 47:15 |
| iteration | 55:23 56:5 57:8 | landscape | Levin |
| 38:1 | jump | 17:21 19:14 20:4,7,22 | 2:17 49:15,15 50:4,7 |
| iterations | 23:14 | 20:24 22:6 | lie |
| 36:1 | June | landscapes | 51:20 |
| | 1:9 44:12 | 20:3 | lifted |
| J | jurisdiction | large | 55:9 |
| Jessie | 29:21 | 10:7 20:20 22:15 | light |
| 2:3 4:3,8 6:11,19 8:1,4 | | larger | 22:14 42:6 |
| 9:13,16 10:2,13 11:5 | K | 20:24 21:14 | lighting |
| 11:16 13:17 14:3,19 | keeping | lastly | 20:17 32:19 33:3,3,4 |
| 23:2,4,8,14,17 24:2 | 21:24 22:11 | 10:22 22:9 | 42:13 |
| 24:22 25:5,12 27:15 | kind | latest | light-filter |
| 28:1,6,19 31:21 | 10:8 27:4 40:7,11 | 38:1 | 17:13 |
| 35:21 38:9 39:2 | 41:13 42:19 | lawyers | limited |
| 40:19 41:22 43:18 | Kindermans | 30:22 | 5:23 32:6 |
| 44:1,9,15,17,20 45:1 | 2:19 7:7,8 | lay | limits |
| 45:4,11,14,19 46:2,4 | know | 27:4,5 | 37:8 |
| 46:8,19,24 47:4,11 | 7:23 8:9 12:24 20:20 | layers | Lincoln |
| 48:1,10 49:19 50:4,9 | 27:4 28:12 29:4 | 17:3 | 1:16 |
| 50:17,19 52:1,19 | 30:18 32:1 33:22 | layout | line |
| 55:20 56:4 | 34:2 35:24 40:22 | 54:5 | 14:6 22:4 53:13 |
| job | 41:6 42:10,14,19 | leave | lines |
| 42:1,17 | 48:12 49:12 51:3,14 | 13:2 | 19:17 21:13 22:14 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | _ | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 53:11 | <u>M</u> | 17:12 19:21 20:3 | Merrill |
| Lis | M | Max | 1:15 |
| 4:7 | 2:10,11 | 7:10 | met |
| Liss | maintain | maximum | 16:3 |
| 2:7 31:3 44:19 53:9,17 | 19:19 | 18:19 19:9,13,19 20:6 | microphone |
| 54:2,7 | maintained | 21:20 22:8 | 15:3 |
| list | 20:6 21:2 | ma'am | minimizes |
| 6:11 10:19 | | 45:19 47:12 | 20:18 |
| listen | major 10:6,7 | mean | misspeak |
| 14:24 15:18 22:21 | * | 8:22 27:6 31:6 33:3 | 13:13 |
| little | majority 20:7 | 34:1 42:15 52:3,20 | model |
| 5:13 37:1 51:8 | maker | 53:5 55:1 | 6:13,14,22,23,24 7:2,6 |
| living | 42:19 | means | 7:9,11,14,16,16,21 |
| 17:18 | | 6:14 | 7:21,22 8:1,12,13,22 |
| local | makeup 25:9 | meant | 8:23,23 9:2,4,7,10,21 |
| 23:21,22,22 24:24 | making | 8:24 34:15 37:2,3 41:2 | 10:8,9 12:11 13:6,9 |
| 27:1,2,5,16,16,23 | 22:16 54:13 | mechanism | 13:15,21 17:9,14 |
| 28:4,10,17 29:3 | 22.10 34.13 manner | 50:5 | 21:8 39:5,5,7,20,21 |
| locate | 20:15 34:6 35:22 | mediate | 40:2 42:19 43:2,3,11 |
| 52:13 | | 21:7 | 43:15 54:22,22 |
| locating | maps 16:16 | mediates | modeled |
| 20:17 | Marc | 17:9 | 42:15 |
| location | 2:17 | meet | models |
| 55:24 56:1 | Mark | 44:23 | 8:9,17 10:3 42:1 54:23 |
| locations | 2:6 4:7 49:15 | meeting | modifying |
| 39:22 52:17 | 2.0 4.7 49.13 market | 23:10 25:21 33:12 | 40:15 |
| long | 11:22 | 40:4,9 44:3 46:17,21 | modular |
| 35:1 | masonry | 48:8,18 49:21 55:6 | 48:5 |
| longer | 22:13 | 55:24 | moments |
| 21:14 | Mass | meetings | 20:22 |
| long-established | 30:23 | 48:7 | months |
| 19:20 | Massachusetts | member | 35:2,6 |
| look | 1:12,17 15:12 57:3 | 2:6,7 23:11 25:22 | MORELLI |
| 9:5 23:1 41:18 44:17 | massing | 28:22 40:5 48:18 | 44:23 |
| 55:16 | 21:22 32:10 55:14 | 49:22 55:7 | morning |
| looking | material | members | 4:12,21 |
| 32:13 37:14 42:9 | 31:23 | 2:2 3:1 15:8 16:4,4 | morning's |
| 43:11 | materials | memo | 49:1 |
| lose | 6:3,6,8,9 21:1 22:10 | 42:23 | motion |
| 7:15 | 33:8 37:8 | mentioned | 42:2 |
| lot | matrix | 25:23 | move |
| 37:13 | 37:22 | mentioning | 36:17 |
| loudly | matter | 26:2 | movement |
| 15:3 | 19:1 45:14 55:19 | Mercedes | 19:17 |
| | mature | 7:23 12:21 | moving |
| | | | |

| | | 1 | 1 |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 6:4 36:2 37:11 51:9 | neighbors | 29:12 | 6:24 16:23 30:18 32:5 |
| multiple | 52:7 | obviously | 36:17,21 |
| 13:16,22 17:2 23:15 | neither | 11:9 15:4 27:18 48:12 | ordinance |
| | 53:2 | offer | 24:7 |
| N | Netter | 5:16 | ordinances |
| Nagler | 2:10,11 4:9 6:21 9:8 | office | 27:17,23 |
| 2:9 4:9 11:17 12:20 | 11:24 14:16 23:23 | 1:10 7:1,2 13:2 16:22 | orientation |
| 23:17,19 26:22 28:3 | 24:8 25:14 29:20 | 17:1 32:21 | 21:16 |
| 28:8 29:8 30:8 31:16 | 33:22 34:16 40:24 | offices | orienting |
| name | 50:24 | 56:2 | 20:15 |
| 4:8 7:7 13:19 15:2,9 | new | officially | original |
| 28:21 | 10:16 45:6 | 29:16 | 10:15,18 34:17 37:23 |
| Nancy | non-40B | okay | 38:1 |
| 3:5 50:10 | 11:20 24:17 | 10:13 11:5 14:1 25:20 | originally |
| national | normally | 33:6,10,18 34:14 | 34:16 48:4 |
| 28:23 29:6,17 30:5 | 28:24 | 40:3 44:9,16 45:11 | outcroppings |
| 31:8,9 | Notary | 47:2 | 20:8 |
| natural | 57:2,10 | old | outline |
| 17:11,16,22,24 20:2,8 | note | 8:16,17 | 15:16 |
| 20:19 21:18 22:7,17 | 6:5 11:7 46:9 | Olmstead | outlining |
| nature | noted | 26:12 | 10:20 |
| 37:2 | 11:16 37:12 41:22 | once | outside |
| NCD | notes | 26:23 51:11 | 43:7 56:2 |
| 25:1 26:7 | 57:7 | ones | outstanding |
| nearest | notice | 46:1 | 5:10 10:21,24 |
| 52:13 | 4:23 44:14 47:6 | open | overall |
| necessary | noticed | 18:20 21:17 | 17:8 |
| 17:3 | 46:20 | open-site | overlay |
| need | notification | 54:2,3 | 28:14 |
| 6:5 9:9 11:10 12:16,17 | 47:2 | operate | override |
| 27:1 28:13 29:4 | November | 24:4 | 24:14 |
| 33:14 36:14,21 50:7 | 57:11 | opinion | overrides |
| 52:7 | number | 15:24 22:24 42:9 | 23:21 |
| needed | 1:6 5:11 | opinions | P |
| 33:16 34:5 needing | 0 | 18:7 | <u> </u> |
| 26:5 | object | opportunity | package 16:20 34:21 36:12 |
| needs | 41:12 | 5:15,17,21 46:10,13 | Pages |
| 6:22 14:18 30:17 37:1 | objective | 46:20 | 1:2 |
| 40:17 42:7 43:1 51:3 | 18:3 | opposed | pair |
| neighborhood | obtain | 31:7 | 18:11 |
| 16:1,8 17:5,7,11,14 | 29:10 30:12 | option | parameter |
| 18:2 19:1,4,6 21:11 | obtained | 43:17 | 24:3 |
| 22:1,2,11 23:12,17 | 30:16,19 34:10 | options 16:15 | parameters |
| 24:10 26:4 39:10 | obtaining | order | 5:8,13 18:13,21 22:19 |
| 21.10 20.1 37.10 | ~~ ~~~~~ | order | 0.0,10 10.10,21 22.17 |
| | | I | I |

| parked | 18:14 | planning | 49:22 55:7 |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 12:22 | people | 2:13,14 6:16 8:5,7 | predated |
| parking | 7:23 13:1 14:24 35:13 | 23:20 33:19 35:7 | 38:3 |
| 20:10 41:17 43:11,13 | 35:18 36:2 40:10 | 36:22 39:11 47:9 | preference |
| Parkway | 41:9 52:7 54:15 | 48:22 | 9:6 |
| 43:10 | people's | plans | preliminarily |
| part | 4:19 | 5:11 6:2 10:11,12 | 5:8 |
| 22:16 23:12 24:7,20 | perform | 11:10 12:9,10 14:11 | preliminary |
| 24:21,23 25:23 26:7 | 15:14 | 16:14 34:17 36:1 | 10:10,11 12:9 |
| 26:21 28:8 37:12 | perimeter | 41:14 50:22 55:1 | premature |
| 43:2 50:2 53:1 | 19:7 | play | 49:4,7 |
| partial | permit | 25:8 | prepared |
| 32:10 | 23:21 29:9,10,11,12 | please | 41:4 |
| particularly | 30:10 31:17,17,19 | 6:4 13:18 46:7 | present |
| 7:3 | 49:23 | podium | 15:17 22:20 39:8 40:1 |
| parties | permitted | 15:1 | 47:8 |
| 23:15 | 46:8 | point | presentation |
| patterns | person | 11:8 19:15 32:12,22 | 14:15 37:13 38:7 40:7 |
| 19:17 20:12 21:5 33:7 | 42:4 | 34:24 37:10 39:6 | presented |
| PDF | perspective | 43:23 49:4 51:7 | 16:14 18:16 35:7 |
| 41:19 | 42:11 51:5 | 52:23 53:13 | preservation |
| PE | physical | points | 24:20 25:4 |
| 41:24 | 8:22,23 9:4,7,10 55:15 | 43:6 | |
| Pearl | 8.22,23 9.4,7,10 33.13 pick | Pollard | preserve 20:16 |
| 15:12 | 42:5 48:1 | | |
| | | 3:9 51:16,16 53:24 54:3 | president 15:10 |
| pedestrian | picked 49:12 | | |
| 19:11,16 21:18 55:5 pedestrians | | Polly 2:14 8:4,6 | pressure |
| 17:17 | picks 9:3 | · · | 38:19,22,23 |
| pedestrian-level | pieces | pose 5:21 | pressured 38:24 |
| 43:5 | 4:11 | possibility | pressuring |
| | place | 44:4,13 45:2 | 38:21 |
| peer 5:6,9,18 6:15,21 9:11 | 18:5 24:5 46:1 57:5 | possible | |
| 10:23 13:14,20 14:9 | placement | 6:4 7:16 19:9,13,19 | previous 34:20 |
| 14:15,17,18 15:14,20 | 21:6,21 | 20:6 21:21 22:8 36:2 | |
| 15:23 16:21,24 18:11 | plan | | previously 34:20 |
| 22:23 24:4,6,7,20,23 | | post 41:11 | |
| | 6:13 10:15,16 12:1,2,6 | | principle 19:24 |
| 24:24 25:9,10 26:20 | 14:23 16:15,17 32:9 | posted | |
| 27:4,6,21 31:24 32:4 | 32:15 34:10,12,13,15 | 46:22 47:1 | principles |
| 32:5 33:22 34:11 | 37:4 38:12,13,15 | potential | 15:18 18:10,12,15 |
| 35:10,17 36:22 38:21 | 39:11 50:14 | 14:6 35:12 | 26:4,8 |
| 39:23 40:9,15,16 | planned | potentially 35:13 | printed 39:15 |
| 43:19 47:17,19 50:15 51:4 55:22 | 29:5 50:1 | Precinct | |
| | planner 7:8 | 23:11 40:5 48:19 | prior 48:7 53:3 |
| pending | 7.0 | 23.11 40.3 46.19 | +0.7 33.3 |
| | | l | |

| privacy | 19:12,14,18 21:17 | 8:19 32:20 34:24 35:2 | 41:2 43:14 51:22 |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 20:16 21:2 | | 40:7 41:20 42:8 | 54:20 |
| | 28:23 29:18 30:5 | | |
| private | 45:6 48:19 50:3 | 55:19 | Realty |
| 19:7,10 | proportion | P.C | 1:7 2:16,17 15:15 |
| probably | 20:10 21:12,23 | 2:11 | 49:15 |
| 24:8 26:9 36:20 52:9 | proposal | p.m | reason |
| problem | 16:9 18:15 | 1:9 4:2 56:6 | 48:20 52:2 53:13 55:3 |
| 38:14 | proposals | | reasonable |
| proceedings | 16:16 41:21 | Q | 36:21 |
| 4:1 56:6 57:4 | proposed | quality | recall |
| process | 15:24 17:9 18:8,22 | 18:4 | 4:13 5:4 30:21 |
| 5:13,18 8:10 16:13 | 19:5,23 21:7,10,24 | question | receipt |
| 18:13 23:5 26:24 | 22:2 32:19 56:1 | 14:2 24:3,5,6,23 25:2 | 11:10 14:11 |
| 27:22 28:7,24 29:20 | protected | 25:13,16,17,19 29:4 | receive |
| 29:22,24 30:2,3 31:1 | 31:7,8 | 29:15 30:20 31:11,13 | 4:23 22:22 27:19 |
| 31:15 47:4 48:9,11 | provide | 31:22 33:17 38:16 | received |
| produced | 8:14 11:3 12:7,9 15:23 | 40:6,8,14,19 41:2 | 11:7 16:17,19,24 32:9 |
| 39:1 | 16:21,23 20:14 22:23 | 45:19 46:2,6,16 | 32:12 33:24 34:22 |
| productive | 22:24 24:11 38:18 | 47:23 48:3,18 49:11 | recognition |
| 16:6 | 44:14 51:5 | 50:21 52:6 53:10,22 | 17:24 |
| | | 54:7 | |
| professional | provided | questions | recognize 18:22 |
| 7:11 | 10:12,14,15 12:1,2,5 | 5:14,17,19,21,22 | |
| program | 12:10 14:17 17:1 | 18:13 23:2,5,8 38:10 | record |
| 39:14 | 30:13 44:5 50:15 | 45:21 46:11 47:12 | 11:13 12:18 35:18 |
| project | 53:19 | | recreated |
| 9:7 10:5,6,7 13:20 | providing | 50:20 54:9,12,18 | 20:3 |
| 15:21 16:3,21 17:2,4 | 27:22 35:14 | 55:21 | red |
| 18:8 19:5 20:11 | Pu | quickly | 42:20 |
| 22:24 25:24 30:12 | 3:6 25:16,19,21,21 | 6:4 36:2 37:11 39:1 | refer |
| 31:15 35:3 42:6 43:5 | 26:13 38:10,11 | quite | 21:6 39:4 |
| 43:6,7 51:17 53:2 | public | 36:14 | referred |
| projected | 3:1 5:16 7:2 8:11 9:12 | | 26:19 37:21 |
| 39:15 49:24 55:12 | 16:12 19:10 21:18 | $\frac{R}{R}$ | referring |
| projects | 26:20 27:20 32:4 | Raise | 6:10 37:9 |
| 36:7 55:8 | 38:15 41:4 42:8 | 28:19 | regarding |
| promise | 48:15 57:2,10 | ratio | 32:18 |
| 50:21 | publicly | 18:20 | regional |
| proper | 41:3 46:19 | rational | 27:1 |
| 53:20 | purpose | 41:13 | register |
| properly | 8:10 12:9 23:20 54:11 | read | 28:23 29:7,17 |
| 55:17 | purposes | 11:20 | registered |
| properties | 27:15 | reading | 30:5 |
| 18:20,21 20:15,17,23 | push | 30:8 52:8 | regulation |
| 21:3,11 | 51:22 | really | 11:18 24:10 29:2 30:6 |
| property | | 8:15 32:21 33:24 | regulations |
| property | put | 35:15,19 36:13 38:3 | regulations |
| | l | | |

| 9:18,20 10:1 11:21 | requests | 18:6,6 | ribbon |
|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 18:19,24 24:15 27:13 | 4:20 | responsive | 45:24 |
| 28:4,10 29:3 30:9 | require | 54:17 | right |
| regulatory | 10:3 11:19 49:16 | restricted | 8:19 26:13 30:7 31:12 |
| 2:14 8:7 27:4,5 | 54:15 | 26:3 | 33:17 41:14 43:6 |
| reiterate | required | result | 44:7 50:24 52:11 |
| 54:24 | 9:18,19,24 10:5 11:15 | 16:20 | rigidly |
| related | 11:22 12:11,19 30:23 | retained | 27:7 |
| 25:16 | 32:2 33:2 35:3 52:15 | 15:13 | Road |
| relationship | requirement | review | 3:2,3,4,5,6,7,8 41:24 |
| 17:18 18:23 24:9 | 28:3,13 | 5:9,18,23 10:5 14:10 | 43:7 45:20 |
| relative | requirements | 14:18 15:14,17,23 | Robin |
| 10:15,18 18:14,21 | 19:2 27:17 | 16:21,24 17:3,6 | 3:7 45:20 |
| 21:22 22:2 32:18 | requires | 18:11,13,18 22:23 | rock |
| 36:22 54:19 | 10:10 52:12 | 24:7,21,23 25:10,10 | 20:7 |
| | rescheduled | 25:23,24 26:10,20,20 | role |
| relatively 7:20 | 4:24 | 26:21 28:24 29:17,20 | 15:16,23 23:9 24:18 |
| relevant | 4:24 rescheduling | 29:24 30:2,18 31:24 | 25:8 |
| 27:8 | 51:21,21 | 32:4,5 34:8 36:22 | |
| remains | Residences | * | rolling 22:6 |
| 5:10 10:20 | 1:8 4:5 15:15 | 38:5,15 40:15,16 | 22:0 roof |
| | | 41:10 47:19 48:2,2 | 22:4,14 |
| removed | resident | 51:10 53:24 55:22 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 46:1 rendered | 41:23 residential | reviewed | roughly 53:7 |
| | | 16:7 30:5 47:17 | |
| 16:14 | 17:10,13,23 19:7,22 | reviewer | Ruben |
| repeat | 21:8 22:4,12 | 5:6 6:15,22 9:11 13:14 | 3:9 51:16 |
| 55:23 | residents | 13:20 14:15,17 15:20 | rule |
| report | 15:8 | 15:21 24:4,6,24 | 27:7,13 30:23 |
| 16:7 | resolved | 26:15 27:4,6 33:22 | rules |
| Reporter | 38:14 43:14 | 34:11 35:11,17 38:21 | 23:22 27:1,2,2 28:5,10 |
| 1:21 57:1 | resources | 39:23 40:9 43:19 | 28:15,17 |
| representative | 18:1 | 50:15 | run |
| 6:15 54:8 | respect | reviewers | 10:19 |
| Representatives | 17:15 19:14 30:12 | 10:23 11:1 27:21 51:4 | rush |
| 2:16 | respectfully | reviewing | 38:21 |
| request | 29:22 | 43:14,15 | Russett |
| 6:2 9:17,20,24 10:16 | respond | Reviews | 3:2,5 19:18 |
| 10:22 11:13 13:15,16 | 24:2 33:20 39:19 41:9 | 16:11 | S |
| 29:1,16 30:17 32:20 | 41:10 49:5 | revised | safety |
| 38:7 45:15 48:22 | response | 6:13 12:1 16:17 32:9 | 32:4 |
| 49:3,3 | 5:22 23:7 36:21 49:20 | 36:1 50:13 | Sam |
| requested | 50:5 | revision | 4:9 31:2 |
| 9:22 11:3 13:6,9,21 | responsibility | 35:7 | Samuel |
| 16:22 45:6,10 48:14 | 23:13 27:12,12 | revisions | 2:9 |
| 48:20,21,24 | responsible | 35:24 45:7 | 2. 7 |
| | <u> </u> | <u>l</u> | <u> </u> |
| | | | |

| coving | 35:13 | 45:8 | 12.2 15.24 16.9 14 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| saying 11:21 31:24 34:7 | seek | sheets | 12:3 15:24 16:8,14 16:17 17:9,12,15 |
| 36:24 52:20 | 24:12 | 34:11 | 19:6,12,17 20:1,9,12 |
| | seeking | shining | 20:20 21:13,15 31:10 |
| says 30:9 46:4 | 11:8 | 20:16 | 32:6,9,15,18 33:3,4 |
| | | short | 34:10,12 37:4,19 |
| scale 17:20 21:22 22:1 | seen 36:11 40:8 54:16 55:8 | 9:8 | 42:22 44:5 46:7,9,10 |
| scaled | Selectmen | shorthand | 46:10,14,21 49:1,8 |
| 10:11 | 28:22 29:24 50:11 | 57:7 | 49:16,24 51:19 52:20 |
| scales | self-imposed | show | 52:24 53:1,3,4,10,11 |
| 21:2 | 38:20 | 42:6,20 | 53:18 54:11,13 55:10 |
| schedule | Selkoe | showed | 55:23 |
| 14:19 44:22 48:12 | 2:14 8:3,4,6,6,24 10:2 | 53:5 | sited |
| 51:8 | 10:4 | showing | 53:8 |
| scheduled | send | 52:21 | sites |
| 4:21 51:22 | 13:24 47:6 | shown | 21:19 |
| schedules | 13.24 47.0 sense | 39:14 | sits |
| 5:3 | 6:7 18:5 36:15 53:7 | shows | 9:4 |
| schematic | separate | 37:7 | situated |
| 16:14 36:8,16 | 31:1,1 | shrubs | 11:22 |
| Schwartz | separation | 20:24 | sketch |
| 2:20 9:15,17 10:9 | 17:16 | Shwartz | 41:17 |
| 11:12,24 12:24 13:5 | serious | 6:9,18,20 12:4 13:7 | SketchUp |
| 13:13 33:13,14 34:23 | 54:21 | 43:22 52:23 | 6:13 7:5,9,14,19,19,22 |
| 35:21 38:16 43:24 | session | sideline | sky |
| 54:10 | 35:8 | 28:12 | 20:17 |
| scope | sessions | siding | snapshots |
| 36:3 | 45:15 51:13 | 22:13 | 39:7 |
| screen | set | sign | software |
| 39:15 | 12:2,6 28:15 31:19 | 54:15 | 6:23 7:4,6,10 13:3 |
| screening | 34:12,13,15,17 36:15 | significance | 38:13 |
| 19:14 20:13,14 | 57:5 | 29:6 | solar |
| second | setback | similar | 21:16 33:4,5 |
| 38:16 46:5 52:24 | 18:19 | 10:16 11:19,20 | somebody |
| Section Section | setbacks | similarly | 4:14 13:5 39:9 |
| 28:24 29:17 30:6,18 | 18:23 19:3 21:12 | 11:22 | soon |
| securing | setting | simple | 38:18 40:18 |
| 30:10 | 20:19 22:7,17 | 7:20 | sorry |
| see | seven | simply | 23:10 48:3 |
| 6:22,24 7:1 8:11,12,15 | 4:16 | 7:21 18:3 19:1 27:13 | sort |
| 8:20 12:22 13:1 | shade | 36:3 | 36:17 39:19,22 43:4 |
| 39:12 40:1 41:14,18 | 33:5 | single-family | sound |
| 42:20 45:24 49:8,24 | shadow | 21:9 | 13:3 |
| 51:5,20 55:10 | 21:16 22:15 33:5 | site | sounds |
| seeing | shaking | 4:13,16 5:1 7:8 10:10 | 40:6 |
| Seems | ~ | | 10.0 |
| | I | I | I |

| South | 53:16 | study | 18:24 42:14 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1:8 4:5 15:15 | standards | 18:14 | surveyor |
| southern | 27:14,16 28:14 | styled | 49:16 52:12 |
| 50:2 | Stantec | 34:11 | suspect |
| space | 2:18,19 7:8 39:17 | subject | 35:17 |
| 17:18 18:20 19:10 | 53:12 54:8 | 27:17,18 28:24 30:10 | suspended |
| 20:10 21:17 | start | 36:14 | 56:6 |
| spaces | 15:1,2 | submission | Swartz |
| 21:1 | state | 34:21 | 6:7 |
| spacing | 22:23 29:11 30:11,15 | submit | |
| 20:13 | stated | 29:22 | T |
| speak | 22:18 23:23 | submittals | table |
| 5:11,12 15:1,3 44:3 | statement | 14:5 | 8:19 47:24 |
| speaking | 41:3 | submitted | take |
| 14:23 15:1 23:15 31:3 | status | 6:3 10:17 11:14 50:23 | 10:1 26:22 28:17 36:1 |
| specific | 6:7 11:6 15:17 | substantive | 39:7,11,22 42:22 |
| 13:10 26:8 51:1,12 | statute | 50:13 | taken |
| specifications | 30:23 31:1 | successfully | 19:8 49:23 54:23 57:4 |
| 6:3 | Steinfeld | 20:5 | 57:7 |
| specificity | 2:12 11:2 33:19,19 | sufficiency | talked |
| 52:15 53:11 | 44:12,16 45:9,17,18 | 36:4 | 38:11 |
| specified | 46:23 47:5 48:24 | sufficient | talking |
| 43:1 | 49:10,14 56:2 | 53:23 55:14 | 26:5 31:5,10 35:19 |
| specify | stepping | suggest | target |
| 41:15 | 22:6 | 39:9 | 51:9 |
| specifying | steps | suggestion | team |
| 34:4 | 49:23 | 4:15,18 39:18 44:6 | 16:5 |
| spot | Steven | Suite | techniques |
| 52:12 | 2:20 | 1:16 | 20:23 |
| square | stormwater | support | Ted |
| 32:17 | 10:23 34:8 47:19 | 20:8 36:24 | 5:7,12 13:19 15:9 |
| stab | Storrs | suppose | 40:17 |
| 5:5 26:22 | 2:20 | 45:23 | tell |
| staff | story | supposed | 7:4 8:17 28:15 46:17 |
| 7:1 8:12 9:11 10:20 | 9:8 | 41:12 47:14 | 55:16 |
| 11:3 14:4 16:4 33:16 | street | sure | temperatures |
| 33:20 34:1,4 35:17 | 1:11,16 15:12 17:19 | 6:9 9:16 24:3 25:14 | 4:17 |
| stake | streets | 33:1 35:18 36:12,14 | terms |
| 49:16 51:19 | 19:11 | 38:2 40:22 46:3 | 12:5 14:10 23:20 24:9 |
| staked | street-level | 50:12 | 32:15 33:5 34:10 |
| 45:6 48:21 52:10 53:3 | 43:5 | surfaces | 37:1,21 53:15 |
| 43.0 46.21 32.10 33.3 stakeout | studies | 20:11 22:15 | terrain |
| 52:12,16 | 16:15 32:10 33:4,5 | surprised | 7:12,21 |
| staking | Studio | 13:11 | terrific |
| 48:19 49:11 52:2 | 7:10 | surrounding | 4:14 |
| 70.17 7 7.11 <i>JL</i> .2 | 7.10 | Surrounding | |
| | I | I | I |

| test | 45:1 | 35:11 40:4 41:20 | 4:20 5:7,10 15:22 18:3 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 27:3 | tie | 44:13 45:10 46:6 | 18:17,21 21:2 24:3 |
| testimony | 34:14 | 48:18 49:21 51:3 | 24:22 25:12 28:22 |
| 5:22 27:19,22 28:2 | time | 55:6 | 29:14 32:24 33:14 |
| 46:14,14 | 4:20,21 11:8,11 12:17 | Town's | 34:9 35:19,24 36:7 |
| thank | 14:6,14,14,21 16:22 | 16:22 32:21 | 38:19 40:12 46:15 |
| 14:1,19 15:5,7 22:24 | 30:22 31:4 35:1 36:1 | traffic | 52:7 54:4,11 |
| 31:21 38:8,9,11 40:3 | 38:19,19,22,23 42:1 | 10:23 17:17 32:4 34:8 | understanding |
| 43:24 44:1 46:5 | 42:4 44:4 45:3 48:2 | transcript | 6:21 7:4 9:21 13:7 |
| 47:10,11 48:16 49:19 | 49:2,17 50:13 51:10 | 57:6 | 17:4,6 18:10 21:11 |
| 50:18 55:20,21 56:5 | 51:19,23 52:3,5,21 | transparency | 22:19 28:9 32:14 |
| Theo | 57:5 | 8:11 | 37:4 45:5 54:17 |
| 2:19 7:8 | timely | | understands |
| | 14:17 | transparent 15:23 | 33:1 |
| thing 34:9 54:20 | times | trash | understood |
| | | | |
| things | 42:17 | 28:16 | 22:8 |
| 6:5 21:19 27:22 35:23 | timing | tree | Unfortunately |
| 40:16 43:8 49:9 | 36:4 38:24 | 20:13 | 4:22 14:10 |
| think | today | trees | UNIDENTIFIED |
| 9:23 10:18,24 11:24 | 56:1 | 7:15 17:12 19:10 20:7 | 45:3 49:13 |
| 12:4,8,10,11 13:1,2 | told | 20:24 42:21,21,23 | unusual |
| 14:11 24:8 25:2 26:1 | 7:5 | 45:22 | 13:4 51:9 |
| 26:8,14 31:3,10,24 | Tom | true | update |
| 33:14 34:6,11,20,23 | 49:21 55:6 | 57:6 | 14:20 |
| 35:14 36:2,20,24 | tone | try | updated |
| 39:2,3 40:14,17 42:7 | 35:22 | 4:19 5:2,19 25:15 | 9:13 10:13 |
| 42:24 43:20 48:23 | tonight | 27:12 41:1,7 | Upland |
| 49:4 50:7,7 51:1,2,7 | 22:20 | trying | 3:4 |
| 52:7,11,15,18 53:17 | tonight's | 36:3 44:4 | urban |
| 54:4,13,19 55:13 | 5:4 15:19 | Tuesday | 15:11 |
| third | topographical | 44:6 | urge |
| 53:1,18 | 17:16 | turn | 31:13 |
| thought | topography | 8:20 37:5 | use |
| 4:23 53:6 | 17:12 32:19,19 | two | 7:11 18:18 19:2 26:1,2 |
| thoughtful | Touloukian | 34:10 44:10 45:21 | 26:8 55:8 |
| 17:5 | 5:7 13:15,19,19 15:6,7 | 48:4 | useful |
| three | 15:9,10,10 26:18 | two-dimensional | 7:17 52:18 |
| 32:15 | 32:8 33:4,7,23 34:7 | 37:17 | utilize |
| three-dimensional | 34:18,19 36:6,23 | typical | 27:21 |
| 37:17 38:12 | 38:6,13 42:24 43:19 | 8:8 10:7 | |
| throw | 55:22 | l — U | · |
| 28:16 | town | | variance |
| thumbs | 1:10 7:1 9:19 11:2 | underlying | 28:13,14 |
| 43:16,16 | 15:13 16:3,11 23:10 | 18:18 | variety |
| Thursday | 25:21 26:19 33:16 | understand | 27:19 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| various | visual | 42:2 | working |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 6:2 28:17 39:22 43:6 | 53:24 54:6 | way | 45:15 51:13 |
| 50:1 51:4 | visually | 8:16 21:18 28:18 32:9 | worst |
| Varrell | 52:8 55:11 | 35:23 42:11 45:9 | 41:8 |
| 3:8 41:23,23 43:8 | Volume | Web | worth |
| * | 1:1 | 55:1 | 49:17 |
| vegetation 21:19 | | website | |
| | volumes | 26:19 41:20 | woven |
| vehicles | 22:7 | | 20:4 |
| 20:12,13 | W | Wednesday | writing |
| vehicular | wait | 44:19,20 | 6:12 |
| 19:16 | 34:7,8 | week | wrong |
| verbal | waivers | 4:12 16:16 32:9 51:23 | 13:8 51:1 |
| 23:7 | | weeks | Y |
| vernacular | 24:12,14 26:5,6 28:4 | 16:2 35:1 49:17 | |
| 21:8 | 48:4,8,14 54:15 | welcome | years |
| version | walk | 50:19 | 8:8 30:1 |
| 9:14 10:14 | 46:10 52:24 53:1,4,10 | we'll | yellow |
| VFW | walking | 6:12 7:14 9:17 11:13 | 45:24 |
| 43:10 | 52:20 | 12:17 14:20 31:20 | Yugo |
| video | walks | 40:17,21 41:6,7,8 | 7:24 |
| 42:2,5 | 53:3 | 43:18 47:5 48:1 | Yugo/Mercedes |
| videos | walkways | we're | 12:21 |
| 42:7 | 19:11 21:18 | 12:13,16 22:20 26:5 | -Z |
| view | walk-through | 33:21 35:9,13,19 | |
| 7:6 35:1 54:21 55:5,17 | 46:18 51:18,22 | 36:3 37:9 40:15 | ZBA |
| viewed | walls | 46:14 49:8 51:14,15 | 5:14 16:11 |
| 6:15 7:19 8:2 | 48:5 | 54:13,14 | zoning |
| viewpoints | want | we've | 1:5 10:4 15:13 18:18 |
| 54:23 | 5:14 8:16 9:6 11:7,12 | 11:14 12:10 39:2,20 | 23:21,22 24:11,15 |
| views | 13:13 18:17 19:5 | William | 25:2 26:3 27:2,11,14 |
| 9:3 19:17 21:14 39:12 | 24:2 32:24 33:11 | 3:6,8 41:23 | 28:10,11 29:3,18,21 |
| 39:14 42:5 43:3,5,9 | 35:18 39:4,24 42:13 | window | 29:23 35:8 51:4 |
| 55:3,5 | 42:14 44:1,3 50:12 | 22:14 | Zuroff |
| VIII | 52:23 54:10 55:20,21 | windows | 2:6 4:8 |
| 1:1 | 55:22 | 37:7 | Δ |
| village | wanted | winter | 0 |
| 16:9 17:9,14 21:7 | 12:17 23:24 34:14 | 53:4 | 02111 |
| 26:12 37:22,24 38:3 | 49:3 | wishes | 1:17 |
| virtual | Washington | 43:23 | 02445 |
| 9:10 | 1:11 | wondering | 1:12 |
| visit | wasn't | 23:9 24:18 47:21 | 1 |
| 4:13,16 5:1 44:5 46:7 | 26:23 43:14 49:2 | work | |
| 46:9,10,21 49:1,8,24 | water | 36:3 37:18 39:23 | 1st |
| 53:10,19 54:2,3,11 | 47:15,24 | 44:10 49:17 51:2,13 | 57:8 |
| 55:10,23 | wave | 51:24 | 1,000 |
| 33.10,23 | | J1.27 | 55:3 |
| | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| | | | rage 10 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------|
| 1 57 | 2D | 0.00 | |
| 1-57 | 3D | 8:00 | |
| 1:2 | 7:10 8:9,17 13:15,21 | 45:4,13 55:24 | |
| 10th | 16:16 32:10 42:1 | 8:23 | |
| 14:8,13 44:23 45:1,13 | 55:17 | 56:6 | |
| 49:13,14 55:23 | 3rd | 86 | |
| 106 | 6:6 41:16 50:22 | 45:22 | |
| 28:24 29:17,20 30:2,6 | 300 | | |
| 30:18 | 56:3 | 9 | |
| 121 | 333 | 94 | |
| 3:3 | 1:11 | 3:4 | |
| 151 | | | |
| 15:12 | 4 | | |
| 16 | 40B | | |
| 23:11 40:5 48:19 | 1:7 9:18 12:9 16:9,10 | | |
| 49:22 55:7 | 26:24 27:13,17 28:14 | | |
| 161 | 34:5 | | |
| 3:5 | 401 | | |
| 17 | 1:16 | | |
| 48:4 | 45 | | |
| 179 | 3:8 41:24 | | |
| 1:16 | 48-hour | | |
| 19 | 44:14 | | |
| 1:9 | | | |
| 1946 | 5 | | |
| 26:15 | 542-0039 | | |
| 20.13 | 1:18 | | |
| 2 | 542-2119 | | |
| 20130094 | 1:18 | | |
| 1:6 | | | |
| 2014 | 6 | | |
| 1:9 57:8 | 6th | | |
| 2017 | 1:11 | | |
| 57:11 | 617 | | |
| 23rd | 1:18,18 | | |
| 14:14 41:1,5 44:12,24 | | | |
| 56:5 | 7 | | |
| | 7/2 | | |
| 24th | 44:19,20 | | |
| 44:6 | 7:00 | | |
| 249 | 1:9 14:14 56:5 | | |
| 3:6 | 7:08 | | |
| 265 | 4:2 | | |
| 3:2 | 760 | | |
| 3 | 10:10 11:15 12:19 | | |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ | | | |
| | 8 | | |
| 57:11 | | | |
| | • | - | - |